

THE
INTEGRITY
OF THE
HEBREW TEXT,
AND
Many PASSAGES of SCRIPTURE,

Vindicated from the
OBJECTIONS and MISCONSTRUCTIONS
of Mr. KENNICOTT.

By JULIUS BATE, M. A.

Ye shall not add unto the Word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it.



LONDON:

Printed for E. WITHERS, at the Seven Stars, in
Fleetstreet, opposite to Chancery-lane.

M DCC LIV.

3 17

У ТІЯГАТИ

антиго

т ж э т в э я в а н

о м

ДІАЛОГІВ О СКРИЛЛІ

Із відомої

ОПОЗИЦІІ ВІДНОСИНАХ
ІЗ ВІННИЦІЮ

А М І Т К А Д І В І С К

2



WOLVERHAMPTON
Robert Speerman, Esq;

SIR,

I have without your Knowledge or Leave, set your Name to this short Tract in Defence of the Integrity of the *Hebrew* Text, your known Zeal for the Scriptures, and the great Progress you have made in that important Study, and the Care you have taken to put it in the Power of others to see the prophetic Writings in their native Beauty, point you out as the most proper Person, I could think of, under whose Protection, I might venture a Defence of the *Hebrew* Bible into the World.

It would have been a great Satisfaction to me, and no less Advantage to the Work itself, could it have

MA

passed

DEDICATION.

passed under your Eye and Correction, to which I should gladly have submitted it, but Fear of being troublesome, Distance of Place, and further Loss of Time, made me decline the Thoughts of it; and such as it is it begs your favourable Acceptance, and candid Judgment.

Be pleased to pardon the Freedom of this Address, and permit me to acknowledge here the Honour I have so long enjoyed of your Friendship, and the very many Obligations conferred upon

SIR,

Your much obliged,

And most obedient bumble Servant,

JULIUS BATE.

A.

P R E F A C E.

SOME Apology may be thought necessary for publishing any thing against Mr. Kennicott's Dissertations so long after Date; and especially after that modest, learned, and ingenious Answer, the Remarks of our too hasty Critick have received from Mr. Comings. I must therefore inform the Reader that the following Sheets were drawn up the latter End of the Summer that Mr. Kennicott published these Criticisms, an Extract out of them in one of the Magazines then accidentally falling into my Hands, having greatly raised my Concern at seeing that the Warb—n Spirit of Criticism had spread itself, and so strongly influenced an Enquiry into the Authenticity and Integrity of the Hebrew Text; and I laid them aside on hearing that an ingenious Gentleman of Oxford, whose Name I was till then

then an entire Stranger to, as I am to his Person still, was preparing for the Press, and would soon appear in Print, and it was thought would give pretty full Satisfaction to the Publick. The Event soon justified the Expectation Mr. Comings's Friends had formed of his Performance, and the Silence of his Antagonist since is a better Recommendation of it than any Panegyrick from them or me can be.

Mr. Comings has left but little to do; but something I think he has; and a Friend of mine, whose Curiosity prompted him to look into what I had wrote, persuaded me to make it publick, as the Subject is an interesting one, and not to be exhausted by one or two Hands, how able soever; and as I was somewhat larger, and had carried my Enquiry further than the learned Gentleman had proposed to do, he thought it would not be altogether an unacceptable, or useless Work to some People; accordingly, at his Request, I transcribed and sent it up to the Press, which has taken up so much of the Time, since my meeting with the Dissertations I am enquiring into the Merit of.

I am sensible to what Disadvantage I must appear after Mr. Comings, in whose Work Strength of Judgment, Command of Temper,
and

P R E F A C E.

v

and Zeal for the Honour of the Word of God, are so agreeably blended, that the polemical Writer is lost in the Meekness of the Christian; and we are not offended at the Correction he gives a fastidious and licentious Critick, who has dared to make freer with the Word of God than would have become him, had he been handling only an Horace or a Terence. The Hebrew Text presenting itself to the World as the Word of God, and in the Nature of a Record, demands the utmost Tenderness, Respect, and Deference. It claims the Privilege of an Embassador, as it comes to us in the Name, and having the Credentials, of the King of Heaven: And as it is a Record it is not to be tampered with, altered, or amended lightly, and according to Fancy of the best qualified, much less of the little self opiniated Critick, who strangely presumes upon some bidden Virtue in that Word, Critick, when he takes upon him to judge what an Author wrote, by what he thinks he ought to have wrote. A Presumption that swells almost into Blasphemy, and borders very near upon the Sin against the Holy Ghost, when the Words of that divine Person are wantonly changed; and Man sets up his own Judgment as a Criterion to settle the Identity of the Text dictated by Jehovah, and so gives us his own, instead of the Words of the Spirit of Wisdom. Even the great Bentley sunk himself in spite of his vast Abilities.

Abilities and Learning, when he wrote for, instead of construing and explaining his Author. This greatly impaired his Credit with the Learned, even whilst he confined himself to the Works of Man; but when he proposed to meddle with the Scriptures, and give us his New Testament, the University was greatly alarmed, and with a high Hand, put a Stop to the presumptuous Design. And if this was the Reception Bentley met with, what might a Warb—n expect, but to render himself the Contempt and Ridicule of every Body? And accordingly he is now a very Proverb, and Fortune has shewn a peculiar Aversion to him, in putting it in his Power to become the Contempt of the next as he is of the present Age. Pope will preserve the F—l from being forgot; and the same Page send down to Posterity two Names, which shewed how far Nature could go, and widen the Distance between the Extreams of Wit and F—ly. It may have puzzled many to find out the Motive that could induce P—e to permit so egregious a Cox—b to have the publishing and writing Notes upon his Works; Mr. Feilding, that humorous Writer, who is a perfect Original, will inform the Reader that it was the Contrast. The Kanity and Ignorance of Warb—n in the Corrections of Shakespear, or Pope, prove Matter of Mirth; but when the sacred Pages come to be treated with the same saucy Familiarity,

Familiarity, and licentious Licence, to use our Critick's Phrase, it must necessarily fill the serious Christian with uncommon Concern. Mr. Kennicott but too closely follows Warb——n in his Manner of criticising, though not so closely as he himself seems to have wished; the Reason of which perhaps may be, that Nature made one, Imitation only the other, what they are. Good Sense, Zeal for, and some Insight into the Text he remarks upon, often shew themselves in Kennicott; in Warb——n never, or very rarely. This vague and licentious Spirit of Criticism occasioned the publishing some critical Observations on Shakespeare, which had they fallen into the Hands of Mr. Kennicott, would in all Probability have shortened his Dissertation on the Hebrew Text. And as the Stop the learned Upton has put to the licentious Spirit in Criticising on profane Authors, will reach the Evil when it extends itself to the sacred Writers, it gives me an Opportunity of returning my poor Thanks to that judicious and true Critick, for this seasonable Performance, of his; and of recommending it, and more particularly, the third Chapter to the Perusal of Mr. Kennicott, and of all such who do not seem to have duly considered what it is to criticise.

I have now only the Reader's Pardon to ask, for troubling him so late with my Remarks upon

upon Mr. Kennicott's Dissertation, and Mr. Comings's for doing it at all; and I flatter myself as secure of both, because my sole Motive for writing is Truth, not Credit or Advantage, which, as Times go, are more likely to follow the Writers on the other Side of the Question.

• *Alloctonus* I. *luteus* (sic) *giganteus* (sic) I
• *Alloctonus* *giganteus* (sic) *luteus* (sic) *giganteus* I

THE
INTEGRITY
OF THE
HEBREW TEXT, &c.
VINDICATED.

THE great Importance of the *Hebrew* Scriptures, as they are the Repository of all Learning, natural and divine, the Record of our Faith, and Evidence for the New-Testament, not only calls upon us to exert, but also will amply recompense us for all the Labour and Pains we can exert about them. The *Hebrew* Language was formed by God himself, who taught *Adam* to speak, and to speak in this Language. It continued to be the Language of the Church of God till the *Babylonish* Captivity, through the best Part of 4000 Years; one Half of which Time it depended upon Memory, Letters not having been revealed, till *Moses* received them from God in the Wilderness, and gave an Account in writing, in this Language, and the now revealed Character, of those hieroglyphical Figures, Rites, and Ceremonies, which had kept up the Faith of Believers, and the Form of Religion in the patriarchal, or holy Line, till the *Egyptian* Bondage had well nigh confounded the Truth of Religion with the Errors of Idolatry, as it would soon have done the Blood of its Professors with that of their Oppressors; that

both the People of *Israel*, and the Faith of *Christ*, which that People were to transmit, together with the *Messiah* himself, down to future Ages, must in a short time have been swallowed up, and irrecoverably lost in *Egyptian* Confusion: But God in Mercy to Mankind interposed, rescued his People, Religion, and Learning, out of the Jaws of Destruction; and to prevent the like Danger for the future, fixed the People in a Country of their own, and that inestimable Treasure of Religion and Learning in writing. So that the *Hebrew* Language, *Hebrew* Character, and the Writings in it, were all Divine, and had nothing Human in them; for what *Moses* did not write, was written by other Prophets, whom God occasionally raised up, and whose Writings his Providence has preserved, and will preserve, to the latest Ages, for our Comfort and Instruction. Inspiration continued in the *Jewish* Church till within about 400 Years of the Birth of *Christ*; so that during that Time, every Thing was perfect and certain with relation to those sacred Records. When Inspiration ceased, the Perfection of those Writings was still the same, and would still have continued so, had it pleased God to have preserved such Copies or Transcripts of them, as came from under the Eye or Pen of Men guided by the Spirit of Truth; but we have no such Copies: The oldest *Hebrew* MS. now extant, doth not it seems exceed 800 Years, allowing all the Antiquity to it which the most probable Conjecture demands. The Copies therefore of these infallible Writings may fall short of the Perfection originally belonging to them, and, no doubt of it, do; at least if they did not, the Consequence would be the same, and no Man could be blamed for suspecting it, when they have so often passed the prophane Hands of those Men whom the Spirit of God has forsaken, and abandoned to Superstition and Ignorance;

fance ; nay to the want of common Sense, and common Honesty. And here is the Wisdom and Goodness of God, who never has Recourse to Miracle when ordinary Means are sufficient, abundantly conspicuous, in that the Ignorance, Superstition, and Dishonesty of those Men, who had the keeping of the *dead Letter* of those lively Oracles God had committed to the Care of their Ancestors, should all conspire to prevent any foul Play ; or contribute to take away all Suspicion of there having been any. Indeed the Multiplicity of Copies must prevent the imposing any great, or material Alterations on the World. They had many Copies of their sacred Writings among them during their Captivity at *Babylon*, several of which were brought back with them on their Return. *Zerubbabel* and *Joshua* on their first Return set all Things in order according to the *Law of Moses*, and the *Ordinance of David King of Israel*—therefore must have their Writings ; and *Ezra* fourscore Years after this, a ready Scribe in the *Law of Moses* had the *Laws of God in his Hand*—is sent up with it by *Artaxerxes*, and he read in it, and explained it to all the People ; from this Time the Church of God being divided by Distance of Place and Interest, and soon after, of Affections, could never conspire in counterfeiting or corrupting *Scripture* ; and in about 100 Years after this, near 300 Years before *Christ*, the *LXX* Version was made, when the cursed Notions that crucified the Lord of Life were but hatching. This Version is a Guaranty for the *Original*, as well as its *Key*. And though it is not of sufficient Authority to determine for, or against, *any one* various Reading in different MSS. (not *one*, because not *all*) yet is it of inestimable Value, as it has construed all, or almost all, the Words of the *Original* ; and determines that there were such Books then in Being, different Copies of

which were then in different Parts of the World, and claiming the Names of the several Authors they are now ranged under ; and that they were then acknowledged as the genuine Work of those Sons of God, whose Image and Superscription they carry. Had there, indeed could there, have been any foul Play, or Reason to admit a Suspicion of there having been any, with the Copies of the Scripture before our Lord's Time ; nay, before those Floods of the Holy Spirit, which were poured out on the *Christian* Church upon his Ascension, were dried up ; it is to be presumed, nay certainly concluded, we should have been advertised of it. Nor could they have called it the Word of God, appealed to it as they all along do, as their principal and chief Evidence for themselves, had there been no Copy sufficiently correct to have ascertained the Meaning of God who spake it. There were a great Number of Copies in Being, and they were daily read in their Synagogues in our Lord's Time, and for many Years after ; nay, have continued to be so in some sort to this Day. They had also a Translation in the vulgar Tongue in our Lord's Time, which was read together with the *Original* in their publick Assemblies, and which is still extant. There was an Order of Men, whose Business it was to transcribe them for publick and private Use, agreeable to antient Custom, for they had a *standard Copy*, a Book of *Jasper*, שְׁפֵדָה, several times mentioned, as the Scribes, *who handled the Pen of the Writer*, are from the very first : And when they had filled up the Measure of their Iniquities, and the whole Body was become corrupt, from the Sole of the Foot unto the Head, there being no Soundness in it, nothing but Wounds, Bruises, and putrifying Sores ; in this dreadful Situation, it was necessary to cut them off Root and Branch ; yet the few remaining dead Branches had

had still the keeping of the dead Letter of Scripture ; were too superstitious to vary a Letter with Design ; too ignorant to understand much of the Meaning ; and too dishonest to communicate the little they did know to *Christians*. They had their Synagogues ; continued still a sort of Church-Service ; had MSS. of the Bible in them ; there Scribes made a Trade of copying them : And as they had different Settlements, in different Places, we have all the Security possible of having the Copies as correctly done, as a human Work can be, or a Work even of this Nature need be. There is no *Christian* but wishes to have an authentic inspired Copy ; but it is not necessary. The Sense of Scripture, the Meaning of the Types and Prophecies, depends not on every Letter being now the same as it was at first. Copy-Errors do not affect, any more than the Errors of the Press now do, the Integrity, nor destroy the Use and Evidence, of Scripture. No Man in his Senses can think that every *Jewish* Transcriber, who was filled with the Spirit of Delusion, could be guided by the Spirit of Truth, and infallibly over-ruled in copying the sacred Volumes, only because they were Sacred. God had forsaken them, and Truth had left their Habitation. It was their Ignorance and Bigotry that kept the dead Letter safe ; and their uncommon Pains and Industry in numbering the Verses, Words, and Letters ; and Attempts to account for every Peculiarity, or seeming Irregularity in Grammar and Phrasology, that takes away all Suspicion of their having wilfully corrupted, varied, or *amended*, the Copies that came into their Hands ; and which, perhaps, were written in the better Days of their Church. The marginal Corrections are alone an invincible Proof that the Text was not wilfully depraved by them ; because, such Corrections would by their Help have crept into the Text itself, had

they not looked on the Text as too Sacred to be violated.

The *Christian* Church was a Stranger almost to the *Hebrew* Tongue, till within two Centuries and a half ago; *Jerom*, who knew most of it, knew so little that he could not read without his Guide; a *Jew* whom he consulted, and with whose Help he compared his Translation with the *Original*. He was the first who attempted a Translation from the *Hebrew* itself in *Latin*; the old *Vulgate*, then in Use, being only a Version from the *Greek*; and the present *Vulgate*, as some learned Men will have it, a Mixture *ex Hieronymi, veteris Vulgatae, et Theodotionis editionibus*, to which the Council of *Trent* has set the Seal of their Church, and impressed the Image of their own Infallibility upon it; and tho' it has so many Marks of human Infirmitie, and scarce a Page but betrays the Ignorance of the Compiler, yet is it with them *Sacred* and *Canonical*, the *authentic Scripture*. If this Translation be, or any Translation could be, equal to the *Original*, they would be in the right to neglect the *Hebrew*, and not trouble themselves about what is *Text*, or the Meaning of it; but we who follow *Christ* and his *Apostles*, and appeal to the original *Scriptures*, as intelligible of themselves, as from the Nature of the Thing they must be, unless God only cannot write intelligibly to us, what is *Text* is a great and important Question, and the first that should employ our Thoughts. We have many printed Editions of the Old-Testament, none of them greatly differing from each other; but widely different from every antient Translation extant; and so great is that Difference, that we must either conclude what we have no other Proof of, that those Translators had other Copies of the *Hebrew* *Scriptures* than have come down to us; or that they wilfully or ignorantly varied their Versions from the *Text*; or that

that the MSS. of such Versions have suffered many great and material Alterations. Which ever was the Case, such Versions are not of sufficient Authority to over-rule the *printed Edition*, or any *authentic MS.* now known, or which may hereafter be discovered. The several antient Translators have taken such Liberties, that it is evident they had not a due Regard to the Text they were translating, in many Places; and they have made such Mistakes in others, that it is as evident they were ignorant of the true Meaning of it. And what wonder when their Guides were *Jews*, Men who knew but little, very little of the Matter, *Hebrew* having been a dead Language near 700 Years when the first *Christian* Translation was made in *Greek* by *Symmacbus*; 200 Years after which *Jerom* attempted to rectify the old *Latin* Translation of the LXX by the *Hebrew* Verity; and that there is Room still for further Corrections and Emendations, all but the most bigotted of the *Papists*, notwithstanding the Edict of *Trent*, will readily acknowledge. *Sanctes Pagninus* was truly sensible of it, and, therefore, in the Year of our Lord 1528, twenty Years before any Copy of the *Hebrew* Bible was printed, obliged the World with his Translation, Word for Word, as far as he understood it. And as he made use of that, or the MSS. which were then known, or believed to be the best, and most correct, and as the *Christian* World in general has since continued to make use of the same, which by his Translation, as it is also otherwise well known, were what we call the *Masoretic*, or Copies publickly received by the *Rabbies* and *Masorets*, and made use of in their Schools and Synagogues, and deemed by them to be the Copies of Copies originally written by Prophets; and as such claiming a Superiority over any Copies not so derived, as the eldest of an eldest Son claims

before an older Man, not regularly descended, we have reason to receive such an Edition of the Bible as the *authentic* Copy. I am far from thinking it impossible that a *Jewish* Scribe should make a Mistake; and it is not at all improbable but that some Mistakes have crept into the Masoretic MSS. and this notwithstanding all the Care they did or could take. But though we do not suppose the Transcribers were guided by the Hand of God, and infallibly directed; yet we *may* suppose that they would revise, read, and compare, perhaps, over and over again, what they had transcribed; which if they did, no great Mistakes could be made: They must see great Omissions, Transpositions, or Interpolations, and would of course insert, correct, or erase, as they saw Occasion. This the Rabbies we know did by their Copies; but this was not done by the MSS. Mr. Kennicott gives us an Account of, as he himself shews occasionally. *Hillel's* Copy, which was a *standard Copy*, was 900 Years old in *Kimchi's* Time; see *Walton* Proleg. 4. Sect. 8. “ Codex hic ab Hillele quadam Scriptus
 “ et magno studio correctus est, per quem vulgus
 “ Judæorum codices suos probarunt. Hujus co-
 “ dicis autoritatem sæpius adducit Kimchi—te-
 “ statur etiam se vidisse partem ejus, quæ vende-
 “ batur in Africa, illo vero tempore, 900 fuisse
 “ annos, cum scriptus erat. Kimchi etiam parte
 “ prima grammaticæ memorat, codicem illum
 “ fuisse Toleti.” In the next Section the Bishop gives us an Account of *Ben Ascher's* and *Ben Napthali's* Editions. “ Ben Ascher—fuit ex Tiberiade
 “ —vel rector academiæ, vel doctor celebris—flo-
 “ ruerunt teste eodem Gedalian circa annum ærae
 “ Judaicæ 4794. id est, Christi 1034. Ut erque
 “ multum laborabat, ut biblia quam emendatissi-
 “ me ederent. Ortæ tamen inter eos dissensiones;
 “ non de dictionibus integris vel literis, sed de punc-
 “ tis;

tis, vocalibus, et accentibus, præsertim minoribus—Babylonii secuti sunt lectionem Ben Napthali, Palestini Ben Ascher ; ad cujus normam conformatur omnia bibliorum exemplaria impressa." This being the Case, it is to be hoped that without vesting the Rabbies with the prophetic Furr, we shall not find so many *very material Mistakes*, and *Corruptions* in our present Text, as Mr. Kennicott seems so confident he has discovered in it by his Address to the *Legislature* for a new Translation of the Bible, and a new Edition of the *Hebrew*, according to his *happy Discoveries* ; see P. 567, et seq. a most innocent Proposal, and what argues the great Humility and Modesty of the Author ! But suppose instead of this *farrago Libelli*, composed of Whimsies or Criticisms, which our English *Ezra* calls upon the Governors of our Church to confound the Nation with, he had only humbly proposed the printing the *many various Readings in his MSS. and Differences betwixt the present Text, and the Versions* ; would not that have answered the End of informing Mankind of the true *State of the printed Hebrew Text*, and of the unprinted one too, without *absolutely destroying* (unless other Countries should have more Reverence for the Word God than we have) all unadulterated, unsophisticated Copies of it ? For what would be the Consequence of such an *Edition*, and such a *Translation* ; but if he could succeed in his Address, the Disuse, Neglect, and so, Loss of all others ! Had the most invertebrate Enemy of Mankind devised a Curse against them, he could not have thought of a greater than what this Proposal, were it to take Effect, must bring upon them. The many hundred Alterations proposed by Mr. Kennicott, and so warmly, and eagerly pleaded for, would justify any other Man in proposing as many others, unless he only is to give a *Loose to Imagination* ; or the World in general

neral will acknowledge that the *Rules of sound Criticism* dwell with him only? Why else may not another bring in his Emendations and Corrections, and expect they should have a Place in this new Edition? It is certain, that MSS. are a sufficient Authority to correct other MSS. by; and Changes made, or various Readings adopted from them, may plead the same Sanction, or have as much Right to be looked on as *Text* as those other Readings, which may by Length of Time have gained a Veneration; but then we must have such MSS. as we can rely upon: We should know when they were written, by whom, and how kept. Can a MS. which we will suppose has lain 7 or 800 Years mouldering in the Dust, neglected, or unknown, and preserved by that very Neglect; discarded at first perhaps for being incorrect, *incorrect now however*; and which it may be pretty apparent was not revised, compared, and corrected at first Hand, either because the Author wanted Time, as writing for Bread; or would not blot his Book, fully its Beauty, and lessen its Price—Can such a MS. or such, be deemed sufficient to over-rule one that was kept by publick Authority, revised and corrected by the Transcriber, compared with other publickly used Copies, and the Differences noted? I should think not, and yet in this or such MSS. there may be some copy Errors, which ought to be corrected, and which other MSS. may lead to the Correction of. Mr. Kennicott in his late *Dissertation in two Parts*, and *Observations on seventy Hebrew MSS.* has undoubtedly made it appear that a Jewish Transcriber might make a Mistake, if that were really ever doubted of, because those MSS. contradict each other, and are all very defective in some Places; as in many Places they differ, some in one, some in another, from the printed Editions. The Design of this Work is to discover and amend the corrupted

corrupted Passages in our present Text ; and he thinks he has discovered, and also happily amended, and restored to their primitive Perfection, a great Number of corrupted Passages. It is not in my Power, any more than it ought to be my Inclination, to attempt to rob any Gentleman of the Credit he may have acquired, or of the Pleasure he may have received from his Labour. He has challenged *a vast Number* of Mistakes in our printed Text, and endeavours by the Help of these MSS. and *found Criticism*, together with the antient Versions, to recover the truer Readings. I am extremely loth to call in question the Uprightness of his Intention, what Mischief soever I may apprehend from the manner of his prosecuting it ; and I am loth to call in question his Skill in the *Hebrew* Language ; though I think he often mistakes the Meaning of the Passages he objects to, and for that Reason does object to them. Nor would I be thought to tax him with speaking with too much Positiveness, or discovering too much Pleasure, when he thinks he has fixed a Blot upon the present Text ; but he is *pleased* no doubt when he comes to a Mistake, triumphs upon it, and treats with too much Levity, as well as affected Superiority, those great Men, who have laboured in vindicating these supposed Errors in our Bible, though he is often mistaken himself, as I hope to make appear in his own Construction of the Passages, many of which stand in more need of the Commentator then Corrector. It is an easy Way to get rid of Difficulties by *correcting* the Words, and would lessen the Labour of the Commentator were it a genuine Way of explaining Scripture. But setting aside the Authority of all his MSS. for the Reasons assigned by himself in his Account of them ; their *Incorrectness*, Uncertainty of Pedigree, want of Age, and other Disqualifications, and the Versions for Reasons that will

will appear as we go along. I shall now begin with the supposed Corruptions, in the Order mostly as the Texts that are objected to stand in the printed Edition of *Montanus*; not as a Bigot to the *Masoretic* Edition, nor prejudiced against it for any private Reasons, but because the Text, as it stands there, is in my humble Opinion, in *most* of the Instances, preferable to the Corrections proposed; which a true and exact Translation of the Words will shew to be in some Cases *not necessary*, in others *very inconsiderate*. To begin then with the first.

Gen. ii. 2. See Mr. Kennicott's Dissertation, p. 529.

“ בַּיּוֹם הַשְׁבִיעִי in die *septimo* in the present Hebrew,
 “ probably corrupted from בַּיּוֹם הַשְׁבִיעִי in die *sexto*,
 “ as in the *Samar.* Text, and *Gr.* and *Syr.*
 “ Versions.”

But not so in *Onkelos*, the *Vulgate*, or *Arabic Versions*, which Mr. Kennicott should have taken notice of; as also that it is not בַּיּוֹם הַשְׁבִיעִי in the present Hebrew, but בַּיּוֹם הַשְׁבִיעִי, nor ever was otherwise that he knows of, there being no Proof that the Numerals in the Hebrew Scriptures were ever written otherwise than in Words at large as they are now. This is one of the Places that the Rabbies own the *LXX* mistranslated on purpose; and this lest God should seem to have worked on the 7th Day, which says *Walton*, *inter somnia rabbinica referri potest, sensus vero idem est in utraque lectione.* Proleg. 9. Sect. 16. The Sense doubtless, taking in the Context, is the same either way, because God was six Days a making the Heavens and the Earth, and all their Hosts, and the end of the sixth, and beginning of the seventh, on which he rested from his Work, are the same Point of Time, only an imaginary Line; “ God finished on the seventh Day his Work which he had made, and rested on the seventh Day.” God worked till he rested; and, therefore, did not finish till the seventh

seventh Day, because he did not rest till the seventh; and the Alteration of the Text is rather founded on a Quibble than any probable Mistake of the Transcriber. The literal Sense is the same either way, but the *spiritual*, the *Perfection* of the *seventh Day*, which is promised in this Text is lost by this unwarrantable *Emendation* of the Words of it.

Gen. iii. 12. p. 343, where **הוּא** is supposed to be put for **חִיא**.

“ And the Man said, the Woman thou gavest
“ to be with me **הוּא** *He* gave unto me, &c.
“ And this Correction is founded on the ab-
“ solute Necessity that the Pronoun of the 3d
“ Person should have its different {Genders.”

But why must **הוּא** be of one Gender only, more than **וּ** or **וְ**, or **וַיְ**, Pronouns of the 3d Person likewise? Why may not **הוּא** be of the common Gender, as well as so many other Pronouns, such as **אָנִי**, **אַתָּה**, **אָנֹכִי**, **זָה**, **אָשֶׁר**, &c. I believe that **הוּא** occurs oftener in the feminine Gender than **חִיא** itself; and I think twenty Times in the feminine, in one single Chapter, *viz.* *Lev. xiii.* and since *Usage* must determine the *Gender* of the other Pronouns, why not of this?

“ Every one knows, that the Pronouns *he*
“ and *she* are distinguished in the *Hebrew*.”

But nobody can prove it; there not being one Pronoun of the 3d Person, that is used in the *masculine*, that is not likewise used in the *feminine*; thus **וּ** is both *masculine* and *feminine*, though **הָ** is never *masculine*, that I remember, any more than **חִיא** is. See *Exod. xi. 7*, where **וּ** is twice *feminine*; and this is the Case of the Pronouns in general; but the printed Copies bear witness against themselves;

“ for most of the Copies have the Points, and
“ the Points evidently direct to the true read-
“ ing of **חִיא** *she* :” p. 345.

But as the Points were not coeval with the Letters,
the

the *birek* under the first Letter only determines that the *Pointers* understood it in the feminine Gender, or to refer to a feminine Noun, which the Context tells us without the *Points*. And this may serve to refute that angry Reflection p. 343, of this being a Mistake, which as none but a *Jewish Critic* could make in Writing, so none but a *Jewish Critic* could publish by printing it; which is barking but not biting; since the *Jewish Scribe* did not make the Mistake, but wrote it as he found it; and the *Jewish Critic* construed it, as the Context shews it ought to be. Under this Article Mr. *Kennicott* (p. 345.) roundly asserts, that many *Hebrew Letters* have been *corrupted* since the Invention of the Points. But should not some Proof have been brought in Support of an Assertion that destroys the Authority of the Scriptures? If any Set of Men ever had it in their Power to take such an unwarrantable Liberty as this with all the Copies of the Scripture, as to *corrupt* them every one; or to let none go abroad but what were so *corrupted*, may it not be suggested that they might at the same time make other and more material Alterations; nay indeed any they pleased? But when did they do this? Where? by whom was it done? A very blind Story this. Many *Letters* were *corrupted*, but nobody knows by whom, or when, or why it was done. The *Jewish Critics* were ashamed, it seems, to publish such a Story by printing it.

There follow three Observations here, *First*, That the *English Translation* often gives the Sense not of *what really is*, but of *what ought to have been printed in the Hebrew Text*. Secondly, The MSS. have not been all examined. *3dly*, Those beautiful Figures, *Enallage* and *Ellipsis*, are not so useful in explaining away Difficulties as that *concise Method* of altering a Text we do not understand into what we do, of which we meet so many Examples in the

Samaritan Pentateuch, p. 346. The two last may be true enough, but the first wants to be proved, it not being yet so clear, that the *Hebrew* is so very incorrectly printed. *Morinus* justly observes, as referred to, in the next Page, that the Writers of the Old Testament were neither ignorant, nor regardless of Grammar Rules; but then we may have made Rules for them, that they never made for themselves, which has appeared to be the Case; and the Occasion of this perhaps was endeavouring to conform the *Hebrew* Grammar to the *Greek* and *Latin*, the Geniuses of which Languages are almost entirely different; the *Hebrew* falls in more naturally with the northern Languages.

—וַיֹּאמֶר קַיּוֹן אֶל הַבָּل אֲחִיו וְיָהִי
the true Version of these Words is —

“ *And Cain said to Abel his Brother, and it
came to pass.* ” &c. p. 347.

There may be another *true Version* of these Words, more agreeable to the Context; for if אמר, as *Mar. de Col. Buxtorf, Leigb.* and others say, signifies, cogitavit, statuit apud se, as 2 *Sam.* xxi. 16. (i. e. to speak within one's self, 1 *Sam.* xx. 26.) then the truer Version will be, that *Cain came to a Resolution against his Brother*, being enraged at the Preference it pleased God to give his Brother, he was resolved against him, and took an Opportunity to kill him. The Word signifies indeed to speak or say something, which a Person may do to, or within himself, as is natural when he is forming a Design, and resolving upon a Thing; and אל signifies against or upon, as well as to; אל ad, apud, *juxta, erga, versus*; variè sumitur, interdum pro ב in; pro בְּ cum, pro בְּ contra, super. Vid. *Buxt.* See *Exod.* ii. 14. where אמר is used in the same Sense it is in the Text above, “ *intendest thou, אֲתָּה אָמַר*, to kill me.” And this may be an Instance that People have been rather too forward in

in condemning the Text as defective, when it was only the Translation that was wide of the true Sense ; and this no doubt it was that induced many of the Translators to insert some Words in the supposed Chasm to supply an imaginary Want, and fill up a defect of their own making.

The Fallibility of the *Jewish* Transcribers may be proved from other Instances, but this only proves the Fallibility of the *Samaritan* Text, and of the *Greek*, *Syriac*, and *Latin* Versions, which have taken the unjustifiable Liberty of *supplying* the Text, out of their own Heads ; and, with Submission, our learned Dissertator seems to conclude too hastily, that the honest acknowledgments made by the *Jews* themselves, of *many and material Omissions* by *Jewish* Transcribers, is the strongest Confession of their having made great Mistakes, p. 348. It proves they thought so indeed ; but unless the *Infallibility* contended for be transferred from the Scribes to these Critics, it only proves their *Opinion*, not the *Fact*. However this it proves, that they had not any authentic MSS. to prove that these Omissions were Copy-Errors only, not original ones ; because if there had been any such, they would undoubtedly have corrected their Copies by them, rather than have acknowledged such Defects.

The Words supposed to be lost here, before *most Hebrew MSS. now extant* were writ, are, *let us go into the Field*. We are very fortunate in having recovered part of the important Words lost, I say, part, because we must have recourse to that beautiful Figure, called *Ellipsis*, for ever discarded out of the Bible but a Page or two before, if there was not more lost than the *Samaritan* Text and antient Versions have found for us, the Sense being almost as defective now as it was before ; for after *Cain* is represented as saying to *Abel*, *let us go into the Field*,

Field, we naturally expect to read, they did so, which our present Samaritan Text doth not say. I shall beg leave to transcribe here Mr. Comings's Construction of these Words, which perhaps may be thought the more easy and natural Interpretation of them. (17.)

“ If this Passage had been rendered, and Cain told it to Abel his Brother, as it might have been, the Difficulty, I apprehend, would have been effectually removed, p. 64.”

It is natural to suppose that Cain related the Vision he had had to Abel, and talked over the Burthen of it with him, which might occasion Words to arise, and the fatal Consequence of spiritual Pride, Murder. Either way the Difficulty is removed; the Sense of the Words being compleat as they stand.

Gen. xxii. 13. “ אַחֲר for אַחֲר *Aries unus*, as “ in the antient Versions,” not *post*, since ele- “ *vavit oculos, et ecce post, &c.* is not very “ intelligible, p. 89.

Three of the antient Versions, viz. the Chaldee of Onkelos, the Latin Vulgate, and the Arabic (if that may be called antient) are a Proof that אַחֲר was in the Text, because they read the Chaldee *post illa*; the Arabic *post bæc*; and the Latin, according to the true Sense of the Hebrew, *post tergum*. And what Necessity was there for the numeral *one* here? *He saw a Ram*, is certainly as proper, as *he saw one Ram*; and if Pagninus's *elevavit oculos, et ecce post* be scarce intelligible, it is not the Fault of the printed Text, and the Author might have given us the English, or any other Translation conformable to the Hebrew, and yet very intelligible, “ *he lift up his Eyes and behold a Ram behind caught by his Horns.* Nor is Pagninus's Word *post* scarce intelligible, for *post* signifies *behind*, or *at the back*, as אַחֲר does; see Littleton. If such Authorities, such stating of the Case, and such Reasoning,

soning, will prove Corruptions in the Text, we shall not have a Verse in the whole sacred Volume without them.

Gen. xxii. 14. “ Furnishes a Demonstration of “ the Change of יהוה into אלהים.” p. 510.

The Word *Demonstration* is of late Years sunk very much from its original and intrinsic Value. It stands often for a *Conjecture* that has scarce Probability on its Side. At *Verse 8*. *Abrabam* says, *The Aleim will see for*, or provide *himself a Lamb* for a *Burnt-offering*; and in this Verse he calls the Mount, *Jehovab Irae*, *Jehovah will see*, or, *Jehovab will be seen*. Is this now Demonstration, that the Word *Jehovab* is changed into *Aleim*? is not God *Jehovab*? or is it not the same God who is called *Aleim* in one Place, and *Jehovab* in the other? If God provided, *Jehovab* provided. And there is reason for calling the Mount *Jehovab Irae*, rather than *Aleim Irae*; because *Aleim* was common to the Gods of the *Heathens*, but *Jehovab* appropriated to the true God: Not to say that *Jehovab Irae* gives room for an Interpretation that comes closer to this prophetic and *antient Typification*, or the typical Offering up of *Isaac* here, than *Aleim Irae* would do; *viz.* that *Jehovab* should appear, or be seen on that Mount, meaning, that Person who took Flesh, and became the Lamb; for *Jehovab* may mean one Person only, but *Aleim* always means more than one, being a Noun plural: And the following Words **אשר יאמר היום בחר יהוה יראה** implies that the Mount was then declared to be the very Place where the great Sacrifice should be offered up. “ So that it was said, at that “ Day in the Mountain *Jehovab shall be seen*.” I suppose the MSS. join with the antient Versions here, to support the printed Text, or else we should have heard of the contrary. And if a MS. or two, in Conjunction with a *Version* or two,

two, is often an undeniable Proof of a Corruption in our prefent Text, surely when *all* conspire to support it, it may be deemed such a Support, as an Imagination cannot overturn. But when I say *all*, I should except the Targum of *Onkelos*, and the *Arabic* Version, whose wilful Deviation from the Text here is a great Impeachment of their Authority, when brought against the *Original*; and they are so wide of the true Meaning of the Words, as also of *each other*, that it is visible they were endeavouring to evade the Sense of these important Words, as inconsistent with that cursed Scheme of Religion which began to prevail in *Onkelos*'s Time; but in *Saadias*'s Time was got to its height, having hatched the *Koran* and *Arabic* to confound *Christianity*.

Gen. xxiii. 2. p. 356. Here I think Mr. *Kennicott* does with great Reason complain of our retaining those *ridiculous Oddities*, and *offensive Irregularities*, in the printing of some Letters, and of *Christians* believing, or retailing out the exquisitely absurd Reasons given by the Rabbies for such Oddities; but as this affects not the *Purity* of the Text itself, they are hardly worth the Zeal and Words he has bestowed upon them; but away with every Thing that is the Invention of the Synagogue of Satan, for there is no Reason to call them *Inaccuracies* of the *Transcribers*; nor do I believe they are so called with any good Design; but away with them, and, among other such Inventions, away with the *Points*; the above carry Absurdity to its *ne plus ultra*, but *pointing* is the Ultimatum of the Devil, and changes the whole Scripture from the Work of God into that of the worst of Men.

Gen. xxv. 8. p. 358. " *Abraham died in a good old Age; an old Man and full; and was gathered to his People; the Sense being now absolutely imperfect, &c.* "

If it is so here, it is so in many other Places, where **מלָא** full as well as **שָׁבַע**, stand for that Fulness the Text is speaking of, without expressing the Sort. So Numb. xxxii. 12. Deut. i. 36. et al. “ because **מֶלֶא** after the Lord ;” which if an *Ellipsis* had not been banished by a royal Edict, I should say was *elliptical*, and to be supplied as the Margin of our *English* Bible supplies it ; and that without supposing a Corruption in the Text. So **שָׁבַע** full, is often used, as in the Text in dispute, Lev. xxvi. 26. Deut. vi. 11. et al. “ eaten and be full,” viz. with what they had eaten. Ps. xvii. 15. *I shall be full when I awake.* Prov. xix. 23. *He that has it shall abide **שָׁבַע** full.* If in these, and many other Places, the Matter that filled, be understood, and to be learnt from the Context, why not so when old Age is spoke of ? The usual Phrase is *old and full of Days* : So is it often, *full of Riches, Honour, Glory, Bread, Silver, Delight*, and so on ; and those several Nouns are sometimes understood ; and therefore *be died in a good old Age, old and full*, is intelligible enough without *Days* after it, the Context leading you to the Sort of Fulness meant, as it must in so many other Places. And it seems highly probable, that the *Versions* did here, what they seem to have done on other Occasions, give that which they thought was the Sense, without following, what in many Cases it was impossible to do in another Language ; the precise Form of Expression, or numerical Phrase. I shall transcribe from Mr. *Comings*, though I do not think him absolutely right, “ **שָׁבַע** signifies *full, compleat, satisfied, &c.* “ *Abraham died fully satisfied with the loving Kindness of the Lord, &c.* ” p. 65. *Days* seem naturally understood ; but of this let others judge : A Man of Mr. *Comings*’s Temper, Learning, and Modesty, may safely be differed from, for Zeal according to Knowledge, and Knowledge according to

to the sacred Scriptures, will never hastily take Offence, being as apt to hear as to teach.

Gen. xxvi. 18. “ *Isaac digged again the Wells of Water which they had digged in the Days of Abram his Father.*” p. 359.

Here עבר' *Servi* is a necessary Reading it seems; for בימ' and authorised by the *Samaritan Text*, the *Greek, Syriac, and Vulgate Versions*, who had none of them Wit enough to correct that other egregious Blunder of the Text, in making *Isaac* dig the Wells, which it is so highly probable, and almost necessary to suppose, his Servants digged for him. The Mistake complained of by our Critics, which gives the relative *they*, without an antecedent, is so very frequent in the Scriptures, and all other Writings, that I cannot but think it squabbling for squabbling sake. To mention only one Passage of sacred Scripture here, *Josh. xxiv. 30, et seq.* which affords three Instances in the Compass of four Verses. However the same Figure that finds out the Workmen that dug the Wells for *Isaac*, will find out the *antecedent to they*—“ and *Isaac* digged again the Wells of Water, which *they* dug in the Days of *Abraham* his Father.” And this among many Hundreds of others, may serve to shew how scrupulously, not to say ridiculously, exact the *Samaritan Scribe* was resolved to be.

Gen. xxix. Verse 1—8. “ A Passage not properly translated perhaps in any one Version, nor properly explained by any one Commentator.” p. 363.

The Difficulty in this Passage, as it stands, is to find out the *Antecedent to the Verbs* השיבו, גלו, שקו, &c. and the Alteration proposed is to change עדרים into *Shepherds*, *Verse 2, 3, and 8.* lest *Jacob* should be obliged to hold a Dialogue with Sheep as St. *Anthony* did with Hogs; but then, though here are People for *Jacob* to talk to,

and to roll back the Stone, and to water the Flocks; yet we are never the nigher, for now there are no Flocks to roll back the Stone for. And we may as well suppose *Shepherds* to be understood to be attending their Flocks, when the Flocks are mentioned to be come, as by the same *Ellipsis* to suppose the Flocks to be come when the Shepherds are. Now as it stands, we have nothing to do but to suppose the Shepherds *Ver. 2.* to be attending their Flocks, and that *Jacob* talks to them. So again *Ver. 8.* that *all the Shepherds attended all the Flocks*; so that the mention of the Flocks implies there were some People to attend them, and for this we have *common Sense*; the *Chaldee*, the *Greek*, and *Vulgate* in Part. That the *antecedent* to *they* is sometimes understood, when it speaks of People in general, not particularizing who, we have seen already; so *Jud. v. viii. xi. and 30.* *Have they not sped? have they not divided the Prey?* It is the Mother of *Sisera* who speaks, but who is she talking of? Here is no *antecedent* to *they*, but *Sisera's* Chariot, and Chariot Wheels; the old Lady herself, and her wife Ladies: And I might with as much Wit and Propriety suppose the Chariot Wheels, and Ladies of the Court to have beat *Barak*, and be dividing the Spoil, as Mr. *Kennicott* does *Jacob* in discourse with the Sheep; or call aloud for an Emendation of the Text. Plural Verbs are used without an antecedent in many Places. See *2 King xix. 35. Psal. xciv. 21. Isai. viii. 20. Eccles. &c.*

But I need not multiply Instances; and before we leave this, I beg Leave to propose a further Correction here, if any be necessary at all, *viz.* that the next Edition may read, *Ver. 2.* רְעִים וְשָׁרְדִּים, *Shepherds and their Flocks*, because it is pity to do Things by halves, as that foolish *Samaritan* does; and hope I shall prove as judicious a Corrector as

our learned Gentleman himself, in this one Particular, and that some MS. or Version or other will be found to contain this very Reading which I now recommend upon Conjecture; and I would have **רְעִם** rather than **רְוִעִם**, because out of a hundred Times the Word is used, it has the **נ** in it but twice.

Gen. xxix. 10. “ MS. 1 omits three Words,
“ *&c.* p. 365. p. 368. ten Words are omitted
“ *ted in MS. 1.*”

Such an incorrect, or uncorrected MS. is of the less Authority therefore.

Gen. xxxi. 18. p. 365.

The Charge here is, that the *Hebrew* and *Samaritan* Text have the four Words **מִקְנָה קְנִינָה אֲשֶׁר רִכְשָׁה**, which are omitted in MS. 1. and in the *Greek*, *Syriac*, *Arabic*, and *Vulgate Versions*, and also in the *Chaldee Paraphrase*.

Then my Eyes deceive me with regard to the *Chaldee*, the *Greek*, and *Vulgate Versions*. The *Chaldee*, “ He led away **יְתֵחַ** all his Cattle; and **יְתֵחַ** all his Substance **דְּקָנָה** which he had gotten; **נִתְחַחֵּה** his Cattle, and **קְנִינָה** his Getting **דְּקָנָה** which he had gotten in *Padan-Aram*.” Had this Gentleman now read the *Chaldee Paraphrase*? or did he take the *Chaldee* from its *Latin Translation*? He should be more cautious in what he asserts. The *Greek*, “ He carried away all that belonged to him, and all his Furniture which he had acquired in *Mesopotamia*, *καὶ πάντα τὰ αὐτὰ*.” What can this refer to, but the four Words supposed to be neglected? They are not very literal indeed; yet as literal as they are in the first Part of the Verse. The *Vulgate*, “ He took his Substance and Flocks, *et quicquid in Mesopotamia acquisierat*;” which plainly points at the Words in dispute, and is a very good Translation of them; though the whole is not literal.

ral. I may say of this Passage, what this learned Gentleman does of the last, that it is not properly translated, perhaps, in any one Version, nor properly explained by any one *Commentator*; which I shall endeavour to shew, as it will prove the Integrity of the Text, and Ignorance or Carelessness of the Versions, and so Weakness of the Authorities that are so often brought against it. And first, **מִקְנָה** signifies *Acquisition* in general, though their chief Property consisting in Cattle, it often stands for Cattle in general; and as Sheep was the principal Part, or Chief of their Stock, it often means Sheep: Mar. de Cal. **קְנָה** paravit, acquisivit, **קְנִין** Possessio, acquisitio, emptio, *res labore parta seu comparata*, facultates, opes, divitiae, *in omni re præter pecuariam*. **מִקְנָה** Possessio pecoris, seu animalium; Pecus majus et minus. Next **רְכַש** signifies to *earn*, and as a Noun, *working Cattle*. See *Marius*. Let us now translate the Words literally as they stand in the Text.

“ And he drove away all his Cattle, and all
 “ his **רְכַש** Beasts which he had earned,
 “ **מִקְנָה** **קְנִין** the Substance of his own ac-
 “ quiring, which he **רְכַש** *earned in Mesopo-*
 “ *tamia.*”

Here are pasture Cattle, Sheep and Bullocks, and labouring Cattle, such as Asses, Mules, and Camels, mentioned first, as the chief and principal Part of his Acquisition at *Haran*; now follow the Words in dispute, *all the Wealth of his own getting, which he had earned in Mesopotamia*. Here are no superfluous Words or Redundancies to be lopped off: No second mention of the Cattle, but a just Distinction made between the several Sorts of Riches he had acquired, and which he had earned by his own Labour in *Haran*. The Versions have all mistaken the Meaning of **מִקְנָה**, though they retain it in the second mention of it; and this Text

is another Proof of what I observed before, that it is an exacter Translation rather than a *better Reading*, which are often required to remove an imagined Difficulty; and this is another Instance of a faulty Omission in MS. 1. occasioned it is likely by the Spirit of modern Criticism; the making his own Judgment the Standard of the *Record* he was transcribing. I shall only observe further, that we have here a very remarkable Instance of the antient Versions supporting the *Hebrew Text*, though those Versions are not *literal*; and, therefore, are very improperly produced as Evidence against the Text itself.

Gen. xxxi. 39.

“ The participle נִנְבַּת furto oblatum, occurs twice in this one Verse, being doubly irregular, having an unnecessary ו, and not having the necessary ו.” p. 368.

And this double Irregularity we are to take for granted upon an *ipse dixit*, notwithstanding that this Word is without the ו four Times in the Compass of five Verses, *Exod. xxii*; as it is in other Places; and as many Hundreds of other Words, it is well known, are in the like Situation. Let me cite from Mr. *Comings*, p. 67. *An Acquaintance with the very Elements of the Hebrew Language would be sufficient to remove the Objection made from the Omission of the Participle ו.* Whoever wants Instances of those Omissions may soon have enough to—make him stand astonished at this Objection, if he will but turn to a few Verbs in any common Lexicon. Nor is the Gentleman less happy in the other Part of his Assertion, that the final ו is irregular; since there are such Numbers of Instances of this *plural Form* to be met with; some of which the Reader may find under רָאשׁ, יְד, פָעֵל, קָרֵן, צָא, פָנֵן, וְכ. and more particularly under whence *רְבָה* from *רָאשׁ*, *רְקָם* from *רְקָמִתִּים*, *רְחָם* from *רְחָמִתִּים*, *מְרָאשָׁתִי*,

Sam. xxvi. 12. **ירכתי ימְרָאשָׁה** from **ירך**, the Sides, Plural frequently in regim. as **נְנָבָתִי יּוֹם** **דְּבָרָתִי** **יּוֹם** Things stolen by Day, is in this Text; and as **דְּבָרָתִי** may be likewise Psal. cx. 4.—*thou art a Priest for ever* **עַל דְּבָרָתִי** according to the Words Greek **ταξις** Appointment of Melchisedeck, when Jebovab the King of Righteousness met *Abraham*, the Figure of his Humanity, returning from the Conquest of the Kings, and *put into his Hand* (the Ceremony at consecrating a Priest) Bread and Wine, and blessed him; and in him *Christ*, the human Part of him who is God and Man, one Mediator, and our High Priest.

Gen. xxxi. 53. “ — one Mistake, and a very remarkable one, by Addition, or Interpolation.” p. 368.

This Addition is condemned by no Authority but that of the LXX.—The Words are **אֱלֹהָה וְאֱלֹהָי נָחוֹר יְשַׁפְּטו בֵּין נָנוֹ אֱלֹהָי אָבֵיכֶם**. *Let the God of Abraham, and the God of Nabor, judge between us; let the God of their Father, sc. judge.* The Words will bear this Construction very well; for there do not want Authorities to justify the carrying the *Verbs* forward in this Manner. And this makes *Laban* for greater Solemnity, and Security, invoke every Thing his Family worshipped, the God acknowledged by himself, and his Nephew, as well as the God of their common Ancestor *Terab*. But then,

“ the Pronoun *their* can refer only to *Abraham* and *Nabor*; and their Father was *Terab*. But no such Expression any where occurs, as the God of *Terab*.” p. 369.

And yet the God of *Terab* is expressly mentioned *Josb. xxiv. 2. Terab the Father of Abraham and the Father of Nabor, and they served other Gods.* But were we to have concluded that *Terab* had no God, if it had not been expressly mentioned? But then farther,

“ *Terab*

“ *Terab* was an Idolater,”

and *Laban* has been thought not to have been much better; and might be as willing to secure the Interest of the God worshipped by his Ancestors, as *Jacob* was that of the God of his Family: And very possibly might have as great a Veneration for *Terab*’s, which was his own God, or greater, than he had for the God of *Isaac* whom *Jacob* swore by. *Terab* was no Idolater however, nor *Laban*, though they served other Gods, or other cherubical Figures, and differing in some material Points from those through which the holy Line served the God of Heaven. *Terab*, at the Command of God, left *Ur* of the *Chaldees*, that he might not fall, or be forced into the *Idolatry* of his Country, and be obliged to renounce the God of Heaven; but worshipping before an Image was not, what we mean by *Idolatry*; but this is not to our present Point. *Terab* when he came from *Ur* to *Haran* had a God there, as it is plain *Laban* had, by charging *Jacob* with stealing his, not *real*, but *representative*, God. This had been the God of *Abraham* and *Nabor*, the Ancestors of himself and *Jacob*, and of *Terab*, the common Father of them all; *Laban* therefore swears by the God of *Abraham* and *Nabor*, and by the God of their Father; binding himself by all that was sacred to him and their common Ancestor. Something was wrong in the Religion of *Haran*, and therefore *Jacob* refuses this Oath, and swears by the Fear of his Father *Isaac*, where there could be no Dispute or Doubt what God was meant; while *Laban* swore by the God of all their Ancestors to satisfy *Jacob*, and his own Superstition and Over-zeal. The Expression is highly beautiful and natural in the Mouth of *Laban*, the Descendant and Follower of the Religion of *Terab*, who established the Worship of the God there, he swore by; and I believe Usage will justify the Construction I have given

given of the Words. The Reverend Mr. *Comings* seems to think the Words, *the God of their Father*, to be the Words of the inspired Writer, and to be read as in a Parenthesis; which if they are, it invalidates all Mr. *Kennicott* has objected to them; they seem to me to be the Words of *Laban* himself, and to come very naturally, and properly, from him.

The ingenious Manner in which Mr. *Kennicott* attempts to account for the Interpolation of these two Words, I would give all due Praise to. But when was it, that there was but one Copy, and that made for Sale? And why must the Scribe be supposed Fool and Knave enough wilfully to leave a Blunder in it lest he should *burt the Sale of his Copy by the discovery of his own Carelessness*; taking it for granted that nobody would read it over, or compare it with the *standard Copy*, according to settled Custom: His Credit, had he been a Transcriber for Gain only, must have run a great Risque by being found out: but we must not canvas every ingenious Supposition too close.

Gen. xxxv. 22. “ This is one of the 25 or 28
“ Places where the *Jewish* Transcribers have
“ left a vacant Space in their MSS—As the
“ *Jews* then acknowledge something wanting
“ here to compleat the Sense—p. 371, 2.”

So something is wanting in *their Opinion*; but it will not follow that something is wanting in reality, or that any Words are omitted in the *Hebrew Text*. Strong Proof we have got here of an Omission in the Text: The Opinion of some *Jewish* Transcribers, and the Addition in the LXX, that *Reuben's Incest* was displeasing to his Father. What is there wanting to compleat the Sense of the Passage as it stands? Was not the Fact true; and could not *Jacob* be informed of it, without the sacred Historian telling us that he was displeased at it? But,

“ a Censure is naturally expected in the History,”

and you have it Ch. xlix. 4. And Jacob's having been informed of his Son's adulterous Incest, is the Reason of his transferring the Birth-right to *Judah*; but why is the Censure so necessarily required in the Chapter above, as to suppose the Text corrupted without it? Had it not been for the Transfer of the Birth-right, in all probability we had never heard of this Crime of *Reuben's*; nor his Posterity have lost that Honour, had they not been guilty of something like the Crime. On so slight a Reason, and on such weak Evidence, does the Author ground his Charge against the Text; which may justly put the Reader upon his guard against him, as one who is to be trusted with the utmost Caution, when he suffers his Prejudices to run so high. The MSS. and all the ancient Versions, except the Greek, support the present Reading, which is such a complicated Proof of its being genuine, as on the other Side would have been called *Demonstration*; and a Man would have run the utmost Hazard of being severely censured, if he had presumed to have disputed it.

Gen. xxxvi. 2. p. 372. “ The present Hebrew Text tells us, that one of *Esau's* Wives was *Abolibamah*, the Daughter of *Anab*, the Daughter of *Zibeon*, the Hivite; but *Anab* appears to have been *Zibeon's* Son, Verse 24.”

An *Anab* was *Zibeon's* Son, and so might an *Anab* be his Daughter: Or suppose we read it, *The Daughter of Anab, a Daughter of Zibeon*; calling *Abolibamah* a Daughter of *Zibeon*, as *Atbaliab* is called a Daughter of *Omri*, and *Abaziab* a Son of *Jeboishophat*: this would only be making *Zibeon* considerable enough for his Grand-children to be named after him. We have the like Instance, in *Cbron.*

Chron. i. 50. Mehetabel the Daughter of Matred, she (or a) Daughter of Mezabab. And nothing is more common than to find the Mothers, Sons, Cities, and Places of Abode, bearing the same Name ; as in *Chron. ii. 20.* אפרת the Name of Caleb's Wife, of his Son, and Place of Abode. *Abolibamah* the Wife of *Esau*, and one of his Sons, a Duke, *Gen. xxxvi. 41.* There are many other Instances of the same Sort ; so that *Anab* in one Place might be a Son, in another it might mean the Daughter of *Zibeon* ; there were many *Zibeons*, and several of the Name of *Anab* : Father, Brother, Son, and Grandson of the same Name, and Daughter too ; unless there was but one Person that was called *Zibeon*. But *Abolibamah* בַת עֲנָה, (translated in the disputed Text, *Daughter of Anab*) *Gen. xxxvi. 25.* is the Name of a Man ; and these were the Sons of *Anab*, שָׁנָן and *Abolibamah* בַת עֲנָה. So that the בַת עֲנָה which has raised the Dispute, *Ver. 2.* might be Part of the Name of *Esau's* Wife, as well as of the Son of another *Anab*.

Every the least Mistake in the Text should be corrected, as this Gentleman rightly observes, to prevent an ill Use being made of it ; and no Mistake, not the least should be supposed, which it is not absolutely necessary to suppose, lest such a Supposition should also give an handle to justify some Error or other. We must necessarily be too little acquainted, at this Distance of Time, with their Genealogies, to settle Disputes about them. The different Names the same Persons went by ; the Change of Names on some particular Occasions ; the Contraction of Names, usual among all People ; the similar Signification of Names of quite different Sounds to foreign Ears ; the compounding several Words into a Name ; the different placing those Words, which made no Alteration in Sense ; these with many other Particulars of the like

like sort, which though I do not doubt they might all be settled, yet may administer so much Matter for Dispute, and take up so much Time to settle, that I cannot but say with a Writer of great Note, that he who willingly enters into this Wilderness has more Time than Wit to spare: And shall only observe further here, that one Version, or one MS. reading differently from all the rest, is so far from being Proof against the present Text, that the present Text, together with them, is so strong a Disproof of that one Version, that Prejudice itself, one would think, could not withstand it, if there be a Possibility of accounting for the Difficulty otherwise.

Gen. xxxvi. 6. " The printed Text seems to have one considerable Fault, in reading, *and Esau went צָרָא לְאָד terram* (Eng.) *into the Country,* (Chal. and Vulg.) another *Country, from the Face of his Brother Ja-cob.*" p. 375.

If the English be a good Translation here, *into the Country*, i. e. *further up into the Country*, the present Reading is preferable to the proposed Alteration, had we any Authority for it. If this be not a true Version of the Words, why had not the Author shewn it before he had given us the *ad terram*, which is capable of being quibbled upon, unless it was for that Reason? Mr. Comings's Translation *into a Country*, is good Sense, and sufficiently evades the Objection.

Gen. xxxvi. 16. " The two first Words in this Verse (*Duke Korab*) are interpolated." p. 376.

The Proof is, that

" *Elipba* had but six Sons." Ver. 11. 12.
Let the Gentleman tell them over again, and he will find *seven*, just as many as there are reckoned *Dukes to Elipba*. He must construe better indeed than

than the Versions have done, to find them out. *Ver. 11. The Sons of Elipbاز were Teman, Omar, Zep-bo, and Gatam, and Kenar, and Timna.* Here I make a full Stop, and suppose these were his Sons by his Wife; then it follows *Elipbاز Esau's Son had a Concubine, and she bare Elipbاز Amalec*, his seventh Son, and Duke. My Authorities for this new Construction, rather than new Reading of the Text, are *i. Cbron. i. 36.* and *Gen. xxxvi. 40*, in both which Places he is clearly one of the Sons and Dukes of *Esau*, and *may be so*, *Ver. 11, 12*, of this Chapter. This sufficiently condemns the *Arabic Version*, which p. 482, is supposed only to be right in this Place; whereas it is the only one that is wrong. And then the only Question is, how he comes to be called *Korab*, which was the Name also of the Son of *Esau* by another of his Wives. At the end of this Chapter, we find the Number of the Dukes that descended from *Esau* according to their Families, contracted; and some of the Families going by different Names, which we may suppose was by two Families uniting by Marriage, or otherwise, with one another, and possibly the ducal Family of *Korab*, and *Timnab*, might do so; and so be called by either Name. But since *Elipbاز* had seven Sons, it is not,

“ sufficiently clear that some Transcriber has
“ improperly inserted Duke *Korab* in the 16th
“ Verse.”

And all the antientest Versions together, as well as all the MSS. I presume, may be supposed, without being sanguine, a sufficient Justification of the present Reading. But I shall wave the Dispute about the Names in the genealogical Tables, and pass on to Things of more Certainty at least, if not of more Consequence.

העבֵר אֶתְנוּ לְעָרִים Gen. xlvi. 21. " Instead of
 " the Samaritan and LXX seem to have read
 " הַעֲבֵד אֶתְנוּ לְעָבָדִים." p. 89.

Or rather they seem not to have understood the Text as it stands, and so substituted something of their own in its stead ; *be subjected them*, instead of *be brought them into Covenant, City by City*. He did not make Slaves of them ; he bought them and their Lands indeed, but restored them on the very easy Terms of paying a Tax of four Shillings to the Pound, in lieu of Rent, and all other Services ; which is scarce half of what is paid in *England* ; so mercifully did *Joseph* deal with them, though the Infidel abuses his Memory for making Slaves of them, and imposing such hard Terms upon them. The Text we may conclude then to be right as it stands, though in Opposition to those formidable Authorities the *Samaritan Text*, and *LXX Version*. And *F. Houbigant* might have spent his Time better than in abusing the *Scriptures* for so little Provocation ; and this Gentleman than in licking up his Spittle, and throwing it out again into the Face of the *Protestant Church*.

העֵבֶר signifies *to pass*, and may admit of another Interpretation or two, consisting with the Context, and will come all to much the same Purpose, with the Interpretation I have put on it ; supposing it to refer to the known Custom of dividing a Calf, and *passing* the contracting Parties through the midst of it, on solemn Occasions. The Word is likewise used for appearing before the Visitors, when their Names were registered, and account taken of them : It is also used for *passing over* an Inheritance, Right, or Property, to another ; or *making over* Men to another, as his Property—Exod. xiii. 12. *הַעֲבָרָת thou shalt pass over to the Lord all that openeth the Matrix—the First born of Man, and the First-born of Beast.* And this may be the Meaning of the

Word perhaps in the Place in dispute. He bought the People and their Lands,—“ and the People he “ made them over City by City ;” caused them by a publick Act to acknowledge themselves, and their Lands to be *Pbaroab's* Property, and then restored them to their Lands and Liberty, conditionally, on paying a four shilling Tax.

Gen. xl ix. 6. p. 56, and 525.

I shall cite here the learned Bishop *Walton*, *Proleg. 9. Sect. 16.*

“ *Vertunt, occiderunt taurum*, quod in Heb. est
“ *suffoderunt murum* ; at verba Heb. שׁור עקרו
“ utroque modo reddi possunt, et ita præter
“ sept. reddiderunt etiam Forsterus, Oleaster,
“ Cajetanus, et plerique interpretes Judæi.”

But let the Reader consult Mr. *Comings's* Answer, p. 30, and I fancy he will be fully satisfied, that this Text needs no Correction.

Exod. iii. 18. p. 380. Jebovah the God of the Hebrews נקרה אלינו, “ instead of נקרה *oc-*
“ *currit*, the Samar. Text more properly reads
“ *וְאַתָּה נִזְבָּח vocatus es.*”

But why *more properly*? The two Words though differing in their *ideal* Meaning, [as, all in אָנָּה and נִזְבָּח, I believe do] come to the same Sense here directly. *Gen. xxiv. 11.* *Abraham's* Servant prays, “ *Lord God of my Master Abraham* נָא לְפָנֶיךָ be present with me, come to me, or meet me, to Day. In this Sense *Moses* and the Elders of *Israel* were to say to *Pbaroab*, *our God has met us, has come to us*, not *hath been called*. And in this Sense of being *present* is קָרָא used, 2 *Sam. xx. 1.* and נִזְבָּח there was present there a *Man of Belial*. So that the Words are used to the same Purpose, and are both proper here, though the Ideas of the Words are different, and either Word would not be always equally proper.

Exod. vii. 18, 19. p. 381.

Here we are told that the *Samaritan Text* expresses the Speeches, which *Moses* by the Order of God makes to *Pharoah* twice; but the *Hebrew Text* once only—generally as given in charge by God, without mentioning the punctual Execution by *Moses*.

When God first sends *Moses* into *Egypt*, he informs him of the whole Progress of his important Commission, as appears, *Exod. Ch. iii. 17—22*, and *Ch. iv*, three Miracles are particularly mentioned; the first and the last that he wrought in *Egypt*; and it is so far from being true that the punctual Execution of the Commission is not mentioned, that it is mentioned over and over again; as *Ver. 6.* of this Chapter, “*and Moses and Aaron did as the Lord commanded them, so did they;*” which is spoke with reference to all the Commands of God to them; and fully removes the Charge of Neglect, or Exceptions, that might be taken at some seeming Omissions, or Want of some Repetitions, which the Course of the History might seem to require, and are now to be taken for granted. The Thing indeed may be thought to bespeak itself, that when God says, *go and say, I will do so and so*; and it follows, *and God did so*; it bespeaks itself, that *Moses* went and spoke what was commanded; but we are not always told so, totidem verbis, as we are in the *Samaritan Copy*. And

“ no Man acquainted with antient learning
 “ can doubt, but that the *Samaritan Copy*
 “ which gives these Speeches twice, derives
 “ the stronger Presumption in its Favour
 “ from antient Custom—”

What Learning is there so ancient, or Customs of that Date, by hundreds of Years, as those *Moses* sets before us? And why may not he be a Pattern to *Homer*, e. g. or *Homer* be tried at the Bar of

Moses, as *Moses* be tried at his? Antient Learning, and antient Customs, are best learnt from the Scriptures, and the general Custom throughout Scripture is against such Repetitions; and when it is proved that the *Samaritan* is the original Text, and not a Copy, it will be time enough to correct that which is as yet acknowledged on all Hands to be the *Original*, by it; such numerous Omissions, Alterations, and Interpolations as must be made to bring in the supposed Omissions again, would make quite a new Book of the Book of *Exodus*; and one would think, that if every thing which hurts the Credit of the present *Hebrew* Text, though ever so absurd and ridiculous, was not to be taken for granted, that no Man in his Senses could believe, that such Alterations were made by any Transcriber. When was it done?

“ Very early, as in the *Greek*, and other Versions, they are expressed once only.”

This will run us up so near to the Time of *Ezra*, and the last Prophets, within an hundred Years of it however, that it is impossible all the MSS. could so soon be lost, or worn out, as that any Transcriber should have it in his Power to mangle the sacred Scripture in this wretched Manner, or be of Authority enough to screen himself, and his corrupted Copy from the Fury of the Populace; much less to force it upon the World, and make it be generally, nay universally received, so that not one authentic Copy should appear to set the *LXX* right in a Matter of such Importance, as the Purity, and Integrity of the Text they held in so just and great a Veneration. When then was this? indeed, when could it be done, through either Design or Negligence? The *LXX*, and *Cbaldee* Versions are sufficient Proofs, that it must be, if it ever was, before their Time; there is not therefore above 100 Years betwixt the first of those Versions and

Ezra

Ezra, for this mangling to have taken Place, in which Time it was not possible for all their Copies to be lost, decayed, or corrupted. And it could not be before *Ezra's* Time; for we cannot suspect this of Prophets, or that the Scribes of the Law in the purer Ages of the Church, and under the Eye of the Prophets, would have dared to mangle the Text in this barefaced Manner, had it been possible for all the Scribes of the sacred Volume to have come into the Combination, and agree exactly what to omit, and what not? And what should tempt them to it! *Brevity*. Why did they preserve any Repetitions then? Besides is it not agreed among the Learned, that the *Samaritan* was a Copy of the *Jewish*, and not the *Jewish* of the *Samaritan*? How then should the Transcribers of the *Samaritan* know what was originally the Text, if the Copy they transcribed from had not the Text in it as it originally stood? It must be Guess-work. And many Variations and Additions did that Transcriber make, both through Design and Ignorance.

One remarkable Place is allowed to have been corrupted in the *Samaritan* Pentateuch, see *Deut.* xxvii. 4. “Locum illum, says Bishop *Walton*, “mendosum esse in exemplaribus Samaritanis, id-“que negari non posse—Hebræorum enim poti-“orem esse auctoritatem quibus oracula Dei con-“credita fuerunt, quique ecclesia Dei permanser-“runt—Samaritis schismate et culto corrupto ab“ecclesiâ divulsis, dubitari non potest. Hoc vero“a Manasse ipsorum primo pontifice Sanballati“prefecti auctoritate freto consulito factum esse“probable est, ut inde templi sui auctoritatem“astrueret, et ab unius codicis in hoc novo templo“auctoritate in reliquos errorem propagatum“fuisse.”—Cumque novum templum erexissent—“Codices proprios revisos emendasse, ordinasse et“ubi deficere visi sunt suppleuisse, ut pro authenti-

cis inter suos essent, non sine probabilitate affirmari potest. Proleg. 11. Sect. 16. This they might easily do, when they were separating themselves from the Jewish Church, and were altering and counterfeiting Authorities to justify their Schism. They were now but one Congregation, and their Copies all in the Hands of the Promoter of this Separation; those Copies but few, and such only as he pleased to give out: This Nest of Schismatics might if they would, (and we know they would, because they did) wilfully corrupt the Text; but the Church of God one would think should not desire, and we are sure had it not in their Power, to make any material Alterations in their Copies, when those Copies were so numerous, in so many different Hands in all Parts of the World, and *Moses* was read every Sabbath-day in so many Synagogues in all their Cities.

In short this is such an idle Charge against the Text, that I am ashamed of it: And if the Author had not thought his Readers Swallow as wide as his own Imagination, he would never have offered to have rammed it down their Throat. Let us run over the Passages this Charge is founded upon. The first is, Ver. 14, 15, &c. of this Chapter, where God orders *Moses* to denounce the Plague on the Waters; and, says Mr. Kennicott,

“ after this we expect to hear that *Moses* went
“ and spake;”

and so we do hear it, for Ver. 20, as soon as the History has told us what God bid *Moses* say to *Pbaroab*, and what to *Aaron*, it tells us, *and Moses and Aaron did so as the Lord commanded*. What had the Lord commanded? Why, *Moses* to say so and so; and *Aaron* to lift up his Rod; and they did so, says the Text; what is it then we expect further to hear, why, the dull unseasonable Repetition of what *Moses* was to say to *Pbaroab*, in the midst of God’s

God's Commands to *Moses*, which the *Samaritan* has so injudiciously interpolated his Copy with :

“ the present Hebrew Text having concluded

“ the Speech of God to *Moses* — ”

where does that Speech conclude? Not where the *Samaritan* Text makes it, at the 18th *Verse*; but at the end of the 19th, when we are told that *Moses* and *Aaron* did what God had commanded them. The *Samaritan* in the most impudent Manner interrupts God's Speech to *Moses*, and sends him in the midst of it to *Pharoah*, with half his Orders, and then falls a wondering at the oddness of it; and his Admirer would fain corrupt the Text because it is not guilty of the Impropriety. Well,

“ The present Hebrew Text having concluded

“ the Speech of God to *Moses*, immediately

“ expresses God's Command for turning the

“ Waters into Blood, and then mentions the

“ Judgment.”

The Command to *Moses* to speak to *Aaron* might be given at the same Time the Command to speak to *Pharoah* was; and so it may not be the present Hebrew Text that concludes that Speech too soon, but this learned Gentleman himself, who through Hurry and Eagerness to pick a Quarrel with the present Hebrew Text, did not see what the present Hebrew Text says, as plain as any Words can say it, viz. that *Moses* did go and speak, or do what he was commanded to do, as well as *Aaron*.

The same Objection is raised against, *Cb.* viii. *Ver.* 4, 5, 23, 24, and *Cb.* ix. 5, 6, 19, 20. The first Instance here concerns the Plague of צְפַרְדָּעִים, which hardly were *Frogs*, as one may conclude both from their coming up upon the Men, and into their Beds, and their kneading Troughs, as from the Etymology of the Word, which makes them some Fly of the venomous *Musketo* kind, for צְפַר is to fly, and יָרַ or יָרָ' to torment, cause to feel.

*Moses is ordered to threaten Pharoab with this Curse conditionally, if thou refuse to let the People go, I will smite all they borders with צְפַרְדֵּעַ ; it is not said in the Hebrew or Samaritan Text, that Pharoab did refuse ; nor in the Hebrew that Moses spoke what he was ordered, either to Pharoab or Aaron, only that Aaron did as God had ordered Moses to bid him do, and a Swarm of these venomous Musketos came up ; which sufficiently implies the Delivery of the Messages to Pharoab and Aaron ; for God would not have sent that Plague unless he had refused to release the People ; nor could Aaron have known that he was to stretch out his Hand with his Rod over the Rivers, if he had not been told he was to do so. The Repetition of these Messages is not necessary, because the Delivery of them bespeaks itself. So again, Ver. 23, 24, the Delivery of the Message is taken for granted in the Hebrew ; as Pharoab's Refusal to release the People is likewise in both the Hebrew and Samaritan as before ; and if we are to take it for granted that Pharoab refused the People Leave to go, why not take it for granted that he had an Opportunity to refuse it ; which he could not have had, if Moses had not demanded it as ordered ? These are meer Cavils, and both the Hebrew and Samaritan Text must be imperfect if either of them are ; while the Samaritan makes Additions which want Additions still, if any are wanting at all ; and some of those Additions disturb the Sense, and others are not at all necessary. And I apprehend that Ver. 20, of the 9th Chapter, which is objected to p. 383, is wrong construed, and that they are the Words of Moses, spoken to the Servants of Pharoab, after he had given the same Advice to Pharoab himself in the preceeding Verse, *Send now therefore, says he to Pharoah, and gather thy Cattle, and let him that feareth the Word of the Lord among the Servants of Pharoab,**

Pbaroab, make his Servants and his Cattle flee into Houses: And be that regardeth not the Word of the Lord, even let him leave his Servants and his Cattle in the Field. The 19th *Verse*, *send now, &c.* are evidently the Words or Advice of *Moses* to *Pbaroab*; as *Ver. 21, 22*, are to the Servants of *Pbaroab*; but the *Samaritan Scribe* has mistaken them for the Words of God to *Moses*, and so makes a *Repetition* of them as such, and begins that *Repetition* in a wrong Place, at the End of the 19th *Verse*, which should have followed the 18th, for there the *Message* to *Pharoab* ends; and this is sufficient Proof that the *Samaritan Repetitions* were not the Work of an inspired Hand; which we shall have farther Proof of under the next Head, where the Credit of the *Samaritan Idol* is entirely ruined by the most egregious Blunder imaginable.

Exod. xi. “ The former Chapter having con-
“ cluded with *Pbaroab*’s Command to *Moses*
“ to withdraw, and *Moses*’s Promise to obey;
“ this Chapter begins with the Orders given
“ by God to *Moses*, in the 1st and 2d *Verses*
“ —now—instantly conveyed to the Mind of
“ *Moses*, &c. p. 385, 6, and 7, and 394.

This is the Mistake the long Criticism on this Chapter, and laboured Defence of the *Samaritan Blunders*, and those Blunders are founded on; viz. that the Notices in the Beginning of the Chapter were conveyed to the Mind of *Moses* whilst he was in the Presence of *Pbaroab*, now, at his last Interview with him; whereas the three first Verses are a Parenthesis, *purely the Narration of the Historian*, and declare what he *had some time before*, not what he *did now* say to *Moses*. The Reader will recollect that this last Interview of *Moses* with *Pbaroab*, was on the 14th Day of the Month, the Day on which the Paschal Lamb was to be killed, and all these Orders had been *at least four Days* before, as

Ch. xii. Ver. 2: " This Month shall be unto you
 " the Beginning of Months—Speak ye unto all the
 " Congregation of *Israel*, saying, in the tenth Day
 " of this Month, they shall take to them every
 " Man a Lamb—and ye shall keep it up until the
 " fourteenth Day, and kill it in the Evening—for
 " I will pass through the Land of *Egypt* that
 " Night; and will smite all the First-born in the
 " Land of *Egypt*." So that what the Parenthesis,
 Ver. 1, 2, says, is true enough, that " *Jebovab*
 " *bad* said unto *Moses*, yet will I bring one Plague
 " more upon *Pharoab*, and upon *Egypt*; after-
 " wards he will let you go hence; when he shall
 " let you go, he shall surely thrust you out hence
 " all together. Speak then in the Ears of the Peo-
 " ple, and let every Man ask of his Neighbour
 " Jewels of Silver and Jewels of Gold." Thus
 much it is plain God *bad* said to *Moses*, and that
 but a few Days before, as is related at large in the
 12th Chapter. And as it was foreseen that *Pha-*
roab would take no Heed to the Warning, the
 Passover is instituted, *i. e.* the Observance of it was
 now reinforced, in Memorial of the Death of the
 First-born, and their Deliverance; and there could
 want no fresh Command to *Moses*, or *Notice in-*
stantly *conveyed* to him whilst in *Pharoab*'s Presence,
 of the intended Judgment; because he knew it was
 to be that very Night; nor of the Time when he
 should denounce it to *Pharoab*, when he was be-
 fore him the last Time he ever was to be so; and
 on that very Day in which it was to be executed.
 And where could the Note that God had given
 this in Charge to him be more properly inserted,
 than just before the Narration of the Delivery of
 the Message? The other Part of the Parenthesis in
 Ver. 3. " And the Lord *will* give the People Fa-
 " vor in the Sight of the *Egyptians*. Moreover
 " the Man *Moses* was very great in the Land of
 " *Egypt*,

“ *Egypt*, in the Sight of *Pharoab*’s Servants, and
“ in the Sight of the People.” This seems as
properly inserted here, as it prepares the Reader
for what follows, and the Connection it has with
this last, and the severest of all God’s Judgments
on *Egypt*. The Parenthesis in these three Verses,
which are purely the Note of the Historian, if it
interrupts the Narration of the last Interview, cer-
tainly explains the last Message delivered by *Moses*
to *Pharoab* in the Name of God. He acted in
pursuance of the Divine Command which had fixed
the Time of the Execution of this Judgment; and
had already prepared the People of *Egypt* to shew
that Favour to the *Israelites*, which nothing but the
Influence of *Pharoab* and his Courtiers had long
prevented, and which in their Fright that Night
they not only shewed themselves, but by their
Clamours compelled the King and his Ministers to
join with them in.

And thus I hope the Difficulty attending this
Passage, according to the present Hebrew Text,
wholly vanishes; and what made it a Difficulty in
the Eyes of our Author, seems to be his not hav-
ing observed, that *Moses* had received express Or-
ders on this Head of the Death of the First-born,
before hand, at the proper Time when he appoint-
ed the Paschal Sacrifice in Memorial of it: And
now at the proper Time, at his last Conference
with *Pharoab*, on the very Day of its Execution,
he delivers the Message in the Name of God, ad-
ding a Note for his Reader, that he spake thus in
Obedience to the Divine Command, which he had
received some Days before, as related at large in
the next Chapter. It is Pity, that the 10th and
11th Chapters are not put into one, because ending
the 10th where it does, seems to dismiss *Moses* for
ever from the Presence of *Pharoab*, and yet within
three Verses more we find them together, and *Mo-*
ses

ses delivering the last Message he ever did deliver to him, when it is not obvious how he came into *Pbaroab's* Presence again; and the Versions ending the Chapter at *Pbaroab's* Prohibition to *Moses*, seems to shew that they really thought the Conference had entirely broke off here, and this naturally makes the Reader think so, and that led them into another Error, the making the 1st and 2d Verses, *the Speech as delivered by God to Moses* now, at this Time. The *Samaritan* Copy goes further, and makes the 3d Verse also Part of God's Speech to *Moses*:

“ as to Verse the 3d, the giving *that*, not by
 “ way of historical Narration, as in the pre-
 “ sent *Hebrew Text*, but as the Continuation
 “ of God's Speech to *Moses*, as in the *Sama-
 “ ritan*; 'tis *this* which gives the Consistency
 “ to the Chapter,” p. 391.

whereas it shews the Impertinence of the *Samaritan* Alterations, since here is no Speech of God to *Moses* to be continued; for *Ver. 1, 2*, are as much historical Narration as the 3d, and must be so, unless *Moses* could want a *Notice instantly conveyed to him in the Presence of Pbaroab*, of what he had been so fully informed of, and for a Memorial of *all the Particulars* of which he had four Days before instituted the Passover, which he was then going from his Presence to celebrate; or there were any Reason to order him now in the Presence of *Pbaroab* to bid the *Israelites* to borrow Jewels of their Neighbours, which had nothing to do with the Business he was upon before *Pbaroab*; or there were any Reason to think that God would now at so improper a Time order him to command the *Israelites* to do what he had in so solemn a Manner ordered them to do a few Days before, and which they were then holding themselves in a Readiness to do. The *Samaritan* Text making *Ver. 3d* a Continuation of God's Speech, was in Consequence of the Mistake that

Ver. 1, 2, were an immediate Speech of God ; whereas they only refer to the Speech of God some time before ; and it is this Mistake, obvious as it is, which led the *Samaritan* Scribe into his bold, unwarrantable, and injudicious Alteration of the Text ; who has done here as the Monk did by a Text he did not understand, attempted to set it right, and thereby exposed both the Boldness of his Criticism, and Weakness of his Understanding to just Contempt and Abhorrence. The Monk not understanding St. Paul's being *demissus in sportam*, very judiciously altered it into *dimissus per portam*, with no little Self-applause, and Admiration at his own happy Genius.

That *וַיֹּאמֶר יְהוָה* may be construed, *now the Lord had said*, meaning *some time before*, I suppose will not be disputed, but see, inter al. Gen. xii. 1. Ver. 9, of this Chapter, and Ver. 1. of the next.

The Unity of the Interview, the Consistency of this with the preceding Chapter, and the Regularity of the History, are all preserved in the *Hebrew* Text, but all destroyed in the *Samaritan* ; the making Ver. 1, 2, an immediate Speech of God to *Moses*, would lead any Man to think, that *Moses* was not in *Pbaroab's* Presence, as in Fact he was not, when God spake this to him. And it is jumbling Things together that have no Connection with one another, as Orders to *Pbaroab* given in his Presence, and Orders for the *Israelites* are ; and nothing can be more improperly jumbled together, either as to Time or Place, than these are by the *Samaritan* Text. The regular Series of the historical Narration is also disturbed by it, for it makes those Orders not to be given till the *Pascal Day*, which from the *Nature of the Thing*, and express *Words* of Scripture, were given several Days before.

The Alterations proposed by our Author, partly from the *Samaritan Copy*, and partly out of his own Head, are so many, and so material, when we consider them as *Alterations of the Text*, and so trifling and unnecessary, as intended Explanations of it, that it justly raises one's Wonder that any *Christian* should dare propose them upon such slight Evidence ; and for, if possible, slighter Reasons. What is the *Samaritan Copy* ? when made, and by whom, and how preserved, that it must thus over-rule the Original ? Suppose any Infidel should urge the Authority of this same *Samaritan Copy* in all its other *Variations* from the *Hebrew*, would this Gentleman be willing to submit to it ? I should think not ; and yet how would he help himself ? But to go on with these Alterations.

“ The Words and Raiment are added in *Ver.*

“ 2 p. 390 : ”

But they are not necessary there, because **כָּל** is a general Term, and includes all the *Utensils* of the House of God, or Man. Not is it necessary for the sacred Writer every Time he mentions this or that Affair, to mention every particular Circumstance, or to use the same Words : If it be, there will want an Alteration and Amendment of every Place in Scripture where this is mentioned. *Cb.* iii. 22, it is only said that the Women should demand these sacred Utensils of the *Egyptian Women* ; and it is added that they should put them upon their Sons, and their Daughters, which is neither mentioned here, nor *Cb.* xii. 35, in both which Places the Men also are mentioned as demanding them ; so that no one of these three Places, according to the Rules of *sound Criticism*, are as they stood *originally* ; and one Man has as much Right to apply these Rules as another, and make Alterations accordingly ; and where would this lead to, but the

Confusion

Confusion of Scripture, and of the puny Critick himself too?

It is not at all improbable but that the Chargers, Bowls, and Spoons, *Numb. vii.* were among the Things now given up to the *Israelites*; but if it is thought that the Word **כלי** doth not also mean more than Household-furniture, it is certainly a Mistake; for they were to put them upon their Sons, and their Daughters, as *Abraham's Servant* gave to *Rebekah* **כלי** of Gold, and Silver, and Raiment, *Gen. xxiv. 53.* Earings, and Bracelets of Gold, *Ver. 22.* and the *Egyptians* gave them up as Acknowledgements of the superior Power of the God of Heaven; as an Offering to appease his Anger, and save their Lives; *for they said we be all dead Men.*

The great Impropriety, or Anachronism introduced into the 3d Verse by the *Hebrew Text*, p. 392, in giving the People of *Israel* Favour in the Sight of the *Egyptians* before the Death of the First-born, is owing to a Misconstruction of the *Hebrew Text*; for **יתן יהוָה** may be rendered *the Lord will give*.

“ The Addition made at the End of this
“ Verse in—the *Samaritan Text* and *Version*,
“ and *Greek Version*—so that they shall give
“ them what they ask—”

is such an Addition as makes no Alteration in Sense, and is sufficiently implied in the Text as it stands—
“ let every Man demand of his Neighbour, and
“ every Woman of her Neighbour, Jewels of Gold
“ and Jewels of Silver; and the Lord will give
“ the People Favour in the Sight of the *Egyptians*,”
must necessarily mean to obtain those Jewels they should ask for; and as it is an unnecessary Addition, it is an unwarrantable one; there being no Proof that those Words were ever in the Text.

The next Paragraph, p. 392, runs in the very Stile and Language of modern Infidelity; and the *Jews* are supposed to have omitted this, and added that, as it tended to the Honour of their Nation, and aggrandized their Leader *Moses*: So that the Scriptures, unless we can get a better Set of them, by the Help of a corrupted, interpolated Copy; and a vague, loose, irregular, and in many Places unintelligible Version, are lost; and we have no Scripture at all since the *Jews* have played such Tricks with it, and made a new Scripture for themselves, not us. If they have had it in their Power to make such *great and material Alterations* without being discovered, or leaving one MS. to confront them, who can give us any Security that they have not done unto them whatsoever they listed? and where then will their Credit be? This Gentleman indeed writes against the present Text, not as supposing it *authentic*, or the best we may have; and may think perhaps he is not to be looked on as fighting on the infidel Side, or weakening the Authority of Scripture, when he is only attempting to destroy the present *Hebrew Text*; but the Consequence is the same, and he that *destroys*, or rather *endeavours to destroy*, the present Text, and purposes only the giving us a Something patched up out of the *Samaritan Copy*, and *LXX.* on his own Head, is in effect doing the Work of Infidelity. This is not collating MSS. and discovering accidental Copy-errors, but charging the MSS. all in general with Corruptions, not trifling, but such large and numerous ones, that the Scribes may be supposed to have had it in their Power to do what they pleased. The Weakness of the Criticism on which this Attempt is made, may, as in the last Instances more particularly, raise our Contempt; yet the Malice of it, or the Mischief that would flow from it, is a most alarming Consideration. Next,

“ The

" the 9th and 10th Verses have been totally
" banished the Hebrew Text." p. 393.

Tho' they are there both of them still, part, in *the very Words*; and all, in Substance, and Spoken at this last Conference. *Ver. 25.* of the preceding Chapter, *Moses* demands Leave of *Pbaroab* to go and serve God; and upon his Refusal to grant it, tells him that God would slay *the First-born of Pbaroab who sat upon his Throne*, is not this the same as, *therefore Jebovah slayeth thy Son, thy First-born, because thou refusest to let his Son go?* and was not this Declaration made upon *Pbaroab's* final Refusal of Leave? But *Moses* doth not say he spoke in the numerical Terms and precise Words; for here is a great Addition to, as well as Omission of some Words in, what he was ordered to say, *Cb. iv. 21, 22, 23.* This is very true; but he had not God's Orders to use those very Words here, though the *very Substance* of what is there commanded, is spoke here; and might be spoke in the *very Words*, on his first going to *Pbaroab*, for ought that appears to the contrary; if it was intended he should speak them, no doubt he did so; all that pass'd betwixt *Moses* and *Pbaroab* is not told us, nor was there any Necessity it should: And nothing can be more trifling than to imagine that he did not execute his Orders, because he did not always use the *very Words* the Orders were delivered in.

Exod. iv. God gives *Moses* three Signs; and *ver. 21.* commands him, "*When thou goest to return into Egypt, see that thou do all those Wonders, before Pbaroab, which I have put in thine Hand,*" (not which *I will put*, but the three just mentioned, as *ver. 28.* *Moses* told *Aaron* all the Words of the Lord, who had sent him, and *all the Signs which be had commanded him;*) but *I will barden his Heart, that he shall not let the People go.* And thou shalt say unto *Pbaroab*, *thus says the Lord, Israel is*

my Son, my First-born, &c. We are not told that *Moses* did perform these three Miracles before *Pbaroab*, no not even in the *Samaritan*, any more than we are that he spoke these very Words in the *Hebrew*, and yet no doubt he did and said all that it was intended he should do and say, and spake those Words, *inter al.* no doubt. *Isaiab* is sent with a Message to *Hezekiab*, 2 Kings xx. 5, 6. compare this with *Isa.* xxxviii. 5, 6. Are the Words the same in both Places, or in the same Order? and yet God spake but once, and one or the other Place, according to this Reasoning, must be corrupted. 3 Kings xxi. 19. *Elijah* is sent to meet *Abab*, and to say so and so. It is not said that he went, nor that he spoke what he was ordered; that is supposed; and the next Thing in the Text is *Abab*'s Answer to him; just as it is in the Commissions of *Moses* to *Pbaroab*; and *Elijah* says a great deal to *Abab* that his *original* Commission doth not mention.

Moses doth not usher in his Speech about the Death of the First-born at his last Interview, with, “ *thus says Jebovab, Israel is my Son, my First-born, let my Son go that be may serve me, &c.*” according to the *Hebrew* Text; but he says all that the *Hebrew* Text, and *Samaritan*, both in this Place, bid him say. But as the Words above were in the original Commission of *Moses*, he is supposed, p. 393. immediately to recollect it, though God in repeating that Commission to him did not; *Moses* however does take upon him to *vary* the Words of it, and by adding them to the Words *immediately before enjoined him*, falls into a most unnecessary Tautology, and incoherently tells *Pbaroab* that God would slay *his First-born*; and then *that he would slay the First-born of Pbaroab*, only to save the Credit of the *Samaritan* Copy, which has foisted in, from another Part of the Book, two Veres.

Verses here, where they breed nothing but Confusion. But enough of these *Alterations*, *Interpolations*, and *Additions*, which tend only to destroy what is without them, not *almost*, but *altogether*, in its original Perfection, as it stands, and *will stand*, till something that looks like an Argument be brought against it. But that egregious Mistake of the *Samaritan Scribe*, in supposing that *Moses* was not advertised of the death of the First-born on the *Paschal-Day*, till that Day in the Presence of *Pbaroab*, when he had in the Name of God named the very Time to the whole Body of the People, and instituted the *Passover* as a Memorial of that Judgment, and their own Deliverance, at least *four Days* before, puts it out of all Dispute that it was a presumptuous, not a sacred, Hand that those Variations owe their Rise to: and this is sufficient to invalidate the Authority of that forged Copy on other Occasions.

The next Article, p. 394, which contains an Omission in MS. 11. of 153 Words, in order to prove, that

“ a *Jewish Transcriber* could be guilty of
“ great Mistakes in transcribing,”

I allow all the Force that the author pleases; and hope that he will allow me that a *Jewish Transcriber* could likewise *revise* and *correct* those great Mistakes when he had made them, or at least could cast aside those Copies, which had such Mistakes in them as the Parchment would not give room to correct; and perhaps this MS. was of that Sort: but those used in their Schools and Synagogues cannot be supposed to have been *unrevised* and *uncorrected*, and therefore not very *incorrect*; and I wonder who it is has imagined that every *Jewish Transcriber* was infallibly guided; because the author takes uncommon Pleasure, as well as Pains, in so often informing his Readers that *Jewish Transcribers*

scribers could err ; and one would willingly suppose him fighting against some body when he lays about him so eagerly.

To proceed—but here let me tread cautiously, for we are coming into Fairy Ground, surrounded with

“ inextricable Difficulties,

“ *Puzzled with Mazes, and perplexed with Errors;*”

and the Cross is erected for them that dare enter the enchanted Castle ; but to come out of the Clouds, with our Author, and speak like other People, we are coming

“ to an Omission ; which, tho’ consisting but
“ of few Words, is very material as to its
“ Quality, and it obtains *perhaps* in all the
“ present Hebrew Copies, p. 396.”

I dare say that *that perhaps* is true, and that it does obtain in all ; in all however the Author has had time to examine, or we should have heard of some fortunate MS. that to its peculiar Honour was uncorrupt in this Place. This *Crux Critorum*, as our Author calls it, is

Exod. xii. 40. Now the sojourning of the Children of Israel who dwelt in Egypt, was 430 Years ; And the Gentleman descants, with great Wit and Smartness, upon the usual Explication of the mighty Difficulty here ; for it is demonstrably certain, as is granted on all hands, that the Children of *Israel* were not 430 Years Sojourners in *Egypt*. Our Author calculates the Time, p. 399.

“ from *Abraham’s* entring *Canaan* to—*Jacob’s*

“ going down into *Egypt*, was 215 Years—

“ and then”

the remaining 215 Years is the Time of the sojourning there. But here we want the Proof. Why, *St. Paul*, we are told, in the Page before, reckons [Gal. iii. 17.] 430 Years

“ from

“ from the Promise made to *Abraham*, when
 “ God commanded him to into *Canaan*, to
 “ the giving of the Law ; ”

which I can't find ; and if he does, he reckons differently from God himself, *Gen. xv. 15* compared with *cb. xvi. 3, 16.* and from *St. Stephen, Act. vii. 2.* who begins the Pilgrimage of this Nation at *Abraham's* leaving *Ur* of the *Chaldees*, and going to *Haran* ; from whence, when his Father was dead, he came into *Canaan* ; but he dwelt *many Days* in *Haran*, and by the above Account 20 Years there ; because after he had abode 10 Years in *Canaan*, it was 400 Years to the *Exodus*, *Gen. xv. 13.* *Know of a surety that thy Seed shall be a Stranger in a Land that is not theirs, and shall serve them, and they shall afflict them four hundred Years.* From this Time to the *Exodus* it was 400 Years, to which add the 10 Years he had dwelt in *Canaan*, and it is plain that the many Days he sojourned in *Haran* was 20 Years. That the last Text cited, speaks of the *Egyptian* Bondage is certain, but then here Difficulties multiply upon us, and we have two Texts instead of one to vindicate ; for it is as certain that the *Egyptian* Bondage did not last 400, any more than it did 430 Years. And here the *Samaritan Oracle* itself fails us, not having corrected the Text in this Place, and so is inconsistent with itself in the other. This Text can't mean that the Seed of *Abraham* was afflicted 400 Years by the Nation that God judged when they came out ; but only that it should be 400 Years from that Time to the end of their Affliction ; and the *same Latitude* of Construction will help us out of our present Difficulty ; *now the Sojourning of the Children of Israel who sojourned in Egypt was 430 Years*, from its beginning. *Thy Seed shall be a Stranger in a Land that is not theirs, and shall serve them, and they shall afflict them four hundred Years*, hence : not that *they shall afflict them*

during four hundred Years. But still the Text makes the Sojourning, to be the Sojourning of the Children of *Israel*, who came into *Egypt*, but 225 according to our Author; and but 205 Years before according to my Account: And this is the *Stone of Stumbling* which is happily removed by,

“ the *Samaritan Text*, that valuable Copy of
“ the *Pentateuch*,”

which reads,

“ Now the Sojourning of the Children of *Israel*,
“ and of their Fathers, which they sojourned
“ in the Land of *Canaan*, and in the Land of
“ *Egypt*, was 430 Years. All here is truly
“ consistent, and worthy the Pen of *Moses*,
“ p. 398.”

Except what is inconsistent and unworthy the Pen of any Writer, who pretended to Over-exactness. *Abraham* sojourned 20 Years at *Haran*, in *Mesopotamia*, before he came into *Canaan*, and *Isaac* a long Time at *Gerar* among the *Philistines*: *Jacob* sojourned also 20 Years at *Haran*: And eleven of the Patriarchs were born there, and some of them were Men grown before they came into *Canaan*, which makes a Defalcation of 40 Years or more from the *Samaritan Chronology*, and leaves but 390 Years for the Sojourning of them and their Fathers in *Canaan and Egypt*. And I suppose a Mistake of 40 Years, is as much a Mistake as one of 200, and makes the Account *inconsistent and unworthy the Pen of a Moses*. Again, as the sacred Writers are bound to speak so exactly and nicely, *the Children of Israel and their Fathers* is inconsistent; because the Children of *Israel* had but one Father, *viz. Israel*. And on this Supposition our Author argues against the Defenders of the Text, p. 397, lin. 17, that the Children of *Israel* means the *Children*, and not the Father; for if it included one of their Fathers it might all of them; and then there

there would be an End of the Dispute. To make Sense of the *Samaritan Addition* you must suppose *the Children of Israel* to be a national Title ; and so *their Fathers* will mean the Ancestors of the Nation so called ; and if *Children of Israel* may be considered as a national Title, that will make Sense and Truth of the *Hebrew Text*.

The Sojourning of the People called the Children of Israel, who sojourned in Egypt was 430 Years ;

for a national Title will include the Ancestors or Founders of the Nation, without any Violence to the common Rules of Criticism. If you take the Term *Children of Israel* in its first and strict Sense, it means only his own Children ; if in a larger Sense, all his Descendants. If as a national Title, or Name of a People, that People were the Children of *Abraham*, as well as of *Israel*, who is often called their Father, and is always reckoned for the Founder of the Nation. But supposing the *Hebrew Text* to have been originally as it stands now, why may not the Sojourning of the *Children of Israel* begin in *Abraham*, as *Levi*, one of those Children, paid Tythe in *Abraham*, being yet in the Loins of their Father *Abraham*, when the Sojourning began 430 Years before ? This mighty and inexplicable Difficulty consists wholly in considering the Term *Children of Israel*, as confined to the Descendants of that Patriarch, and not as a national Title, or Title of a Nation whose Ancestors are as much Part of the Nation, as the Descendants themselves : And the Text above so much carped at, in the most disadvantageous Light you can set it in, speaks but the Language of *St. Paul*, which there never has been any Dispute about ; that the Children of *Israel*, as the Seed of *Abraham*, were Sojourners when in the Loins of their Father *Abraham* ;

bam; or that the Sojourning of their Nation begun 430 Years before.

We read Numb. xxxiii. 31, that *the Children of Israel encamped in ipy, בְּנֵי יַעֲקֹב* the Sons of Jaakan; suppose it were asked, how they could encamp in the Sons of Jaakan, would it not be sufficient to answer, that it was become the Name of a Place, and so had lost its *constructive* Meaning? And is not this the Case when *בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל* is used as the Title of a Nation, as in this very Text, for there was not one of the Sons of Israel here, “ the nearest to him was “ five Removes off.”

So this Crux Criticorum, erected upon a meer Quibble, and supported only by the blundering Correction of a counterfeit Copy of the Pentateuch, may be in Danger of falling upon the Head of those who set it up.

I do not here suppose, as some are said, p. 397, to have done, that by *Egypt* is to be understood *Egypt* and *Canaan* both; which Supposition inserted by the Samaritan Scribe into the Text, leaves us just where it found us, *puzzled with Mazes and perplexed with Errors*. Nor would I have *the Children of Israel* to signify them and *their Father*, when the *Children only* are spoke of; but I really would have a Nation or People, when spoke of as a Nation or People, include the Ancestors as well as the Descendants. And *Children of Israel* in the Text above, I do think to be used as a national Title for all the Children of *Abraham*, who came through the Loins of *Israel*; and that the first Founder of any Nation is Part of that Nation; so that the Text above is Sense and Truth notwithstanding that *Isaac* and *Abraham* were not Children of *Israel*. A Nation must have some Name, and that was become the Name of this People.

Exod. xv. 2. “The present Hebrew Text is
“ זָמְרָת יְהֹוָה ; but זָמְרָת being irregu-
“ lar—”

why, this Gentleman has forgot to tell us ; it is Usage must determine what is the *jus et norma loquendi* ; and this Word occurs several other Times in this very manner, as Mr. *Comings* observes ; and so do other Words perhaps *hundreds* of Times ; such as חַטָּאת, קָטָרָת, צָרָעָת, כְּפָחָת, &c. when not in regimine ;

“—but זָמְרָת being irregular, should probably be זָמְרָתִי *et laus mea* agreeably to the “ *Chaldee, Arabic, and Vulgate Versions*—
“ the ' is necessary to זָמְרָת—four of the six
“ valuable *Samaritan MSS.* agree in Reading
“ it so,” p. 400.

Suppose we construe the present Text, *I will sing to Jehovah ; my Strength and Song is of (or to) God, for he is become my Salvation* ; and so make זָמְרָת in regimine ; where then will be the Irregularity complained of, and the Necessity of interpolating a ' ? The Versions have changed the Order of the Words, but they have not changed the Sense. The change of the נ into נ in *construct*, makes the Song here directed to God, or be concerning him, which is a plain and easy Construction, and gives the same Sense all the Versions do. And this Instance among others, is a Proof, that this Gentleman has set himself up for Judge of the Text, without being conversant enough in it to construe it even according to the common observed Rules of the Tongue. And I hope it will teach him not to be quite so forward in pronouncing Sentence against the Text. Every time he meets with any Thing which is not literally translated in the Versions, or in one or two of them, he falls immediately upon the Text, and without Mercy tears it to Pieces, only to shew his Skill in new making it ; and all for the Honour of

the original *Word of God*. I know not how the *Samaritan MSS.* read here, but if the printed *Samaritan Copy* read זָמְרָתִי֙ as one Word, and erroneously for זָמְרָתִי֙, it must read wrong, because there will want יְהִי then to make Sense of the Passage.

Exod. xviii. 5, 6, 7. *Jethro came unto Moses*—
and he said unto Moses, “ *I am come unto*
“ *tbee*—*and Moses went out to meet his Father*
“ *in Law*—*The Hebrew Copies used by the*
“ *Authors of the Greek and Syriac Versions*
“ *seem to have had the truer Reading, חָנָה*
“ *ecce, instead of אָנִי ego.*” p. 401.

Only construe וַיֹּאמֶר Ver. 6. as Mr. *Comings* does, *be sent Word*; and בָּא, [not, *I am come*, but] *I come*, or *am coming*; and the Alteration proposed will be altogether unnecessary; and the Person by whom he said this to *Moses*, need not be mentioned, but may as fairly be understood as *Isaac's Servants* are, *Gen. xxvi. 18.* *And Isaac digged again the Wells of Water.*

Exod. xxv. 31. “ *We have here the Word*
“ *תִּיעַש*—*Nullius formæ nulliusque interpreta-*
“ *tionis, p. 402.*”

supposing there were such a Verb as עִישָׁה, its *Form* and *Interpretation* would be easily found. If there were such a Verb, this is the only Place it is used in as far as I know; and would then be to be reckoned among the several others that occur but once. *תִּיעַש* is not regularly derived from עִשָּׁה, but if עִשָּׁה were made a Verb with the *formitative Jod*, as רְשָׁה whence יְצָר, יְרַשׁ whence טְוָב, יְצָר whence שְׁבָב, שְׁבָב whence עַזְבָּה; שְׁבָב from עַזְבָּה; שְׁבָב from שְׁבָב, &c. are in the like manner, its *Form* would be found, as *תִּשְׁנָה* from sleep; *תִּבְבָּב* from נְבָב, *Jud. 5.* and these Instances may abate a little of the Positiveness that F. *Houbigant* expresses himself with. But let it pass for an Error of the Transcriber, it is the first we have yet met with that

that there seems sufficient Reason to acknowledge as such; not that this is so evidently certain, and there were MSS. of Credit once that disowned the in this Place. And I shall only observe further, that Mr. Kennicott has flung out Abundance of Froth here that is of no Use to the Argument, nor Credit to himself.

Exod. xxix. 11. “ **לְ** *ad* is necessary, and is found in all the Versions, an Example this of a Reading entirely different from the printed Hebrew, and yet entirely agreeing with the ancient Versions.” p. 406.

If this were the only Place, and there were not Hundreds upon Hundreds of Places more, where this and other *Prepositions* are wanting, and understood in the Context, there would be some Ground in the Reasoning above. The Omission of such *Prepositions* is conformable to the Genius of the Hebrew, but not to that of many other Languages. The Versions are no Proof that **לְ** was originally in this Place, any more than they are that it and others were in Numbers of other Places. As I hope the Gentleman will by and by be a little more converfant with the Hebrew Text, I shall not point out many Instances of this Nature, but what are to be met with in this Part of Scripture; see *Cb. xxviii.* *Ver. 8, 11, 13, 15, 31, 32, 33, 36, 39,* and *Ver. 9,* of this Chapter, and *Ver. 32 and 42, &c.* in the Compass of which two Chapters alone, the *necessary* Prepositions, as Mr. Kennicott calls **לְ**, are as often wanting almost as there are Verses in them; and yet the antient Versions translate as if the Prepositions were read in the Text. This very Word **פְּתַח** wants the Preposition near 40 Times in the Pentateuch alone; three Times in this Chapter, and four Times in the Compass of four Verses in the 33d Chapter. Let the Unprejudiced judge with what View Mr. Kennicott could pick out this single

Place out of so many to object to. And whether these Omissions are the Fault of the Copies, or agreeable to the Genius of the Language, I must submit to a better Acquaintance with the Text.

Lev. i. 1. The Whim of the Transcribers in writing the **ו** in a *lesser* Size, hurts not the Integrity of the Text; and the more than childish Reasons given by those Ideots the Rabbins for it, are too stupid to be repeated, unless the Author thought that these Dotages affected the Text itself.

Lev. iv. 29. “ *He shall slay the Sin-offering in the Place of the Burnt-offering,* which MS. “ 4. reads *in the Place where he slays the Burnt-offering*—this very remarkable various Reading—” p. 409.

as they all are; if they do but differ from the Text, though the Sense is the same. But the Text must be wrong here because the very Words, *where be slays* occur *Ver. 24, and 33,* in the *Hebrew Text* itself; and there was an absolute Necessity for *Moses* never to vary his Phrase, but always to speak in the same Words. *Place of the Altar, Place of the Canaanite, the Place of the Ashes, the Place of the Blood of the Trespass-offering;* and other such like Phrases seem exactly parallel to that in the Text, *the Place of the Burnt-offering.* Whether the Author’s Head run round or mine I cannot tell; but I can hardly believe my Eyes, when I see so much ado about nothing.

Lev. v. 1. “ **לוֹא** non occurs 35 Times in this Form; but is in other Places more regularly expressed **אַל**. pag. 409.”

But p. 550, the Case here was mistated, and now **אַל** is the more regular Reading, the **ו** having been cut by the *Pointers* in all but 35 Places, which if true hurts the Credit of the *Samaritan Copy*, which

“ reads

“ reads the Word regularly, without a ;
“ perhaps in every Place as well as here,”

p. 410.

because it makes that Copy later than the Invention of the *Points*, and to be the Work of *Masoretic Hands*.

Most of the *Hebrew Particles*, if not all of them, have *Verbs* or *Nouns* used in the same, or as nearly as possible in the same Sense. And the Distinction of *Preposition*, *Conjunction*, &c. as *undeclined*, as they are in *Latin* or *Greek*, has no Place in *Hebrew*. The Root carries the Idea ; and that Root stands as a *Particle* in the same Sense, or to the same Purpose, as if it were a *Noun* : Thus נַלְ is a Root to weary out, wear down a Person’s Strength, and bring to nothing ; and so נַלְ is used as a *Negative*, not, nothing. And the Propriety of writing it with or without the ; must depend upon the same Rules, the omitting or inserting it does in other *Nouns*, if I do not give Offence in calling נַלְ (*non*, *nihil*,) a *Noun* ; but the Terms of the *Latin Grammar* will not hold in *Hebrew* or *English* ; and the using them confounds the *Hebrew Grammar* ; תַּנְ and אֹותּ, as a *Sign*, a *Pronoun*, as we call it, are used promiscuously, as נַלְ and לְנַלְ are.

Numb. iii. See p. 99.

The Tribe of *Levi* is numbered here under the three Families of *Kershon*, *Kobath*, and *Merari*, which are afterwards subdivided into several others ; *Kobath* into those of *Amram*, *Frebar*, *Hebron*, and *Uzziel* ; and all the Males of these three Families are numbered ; therefore *all the Males descended from Kobath are numbered*, and they are found to be 8,600, which with 7,500 *Gershonites*, and 6,200 *Merarites* make 22,300 ; whereas *Ver. 39* ; *all that were numbered of the Levites were 22,000 only* ; so “ there must have been a Mistake,”

or

or Misunderstanding, *somewhere*: The readiest way of accounting for which is to suppose the Text corrupted; and the readiest way again to account for that Corruption, is to suppose the *Numbers* not written in Words at large as they are in all our Copies now, but in *numeral Letters*; to the *Change then of some similar numeral Letter*, the above Mistake is attributed; and this second Supposition is a *certain Proof* that the *Hebrew Numbers were formerly expressed by Numerals*; for

“ there is scarce a Possibility of doubting;” but that two *similar* numeral Letters have been mistaken one for the other in this Place.

But cannot we account for this seeming Mistake without recurring to these two Suppositions, of neither of which we have any Evidence or positive Proof at all? All the MSS. and all the Versions (except the LXX. who read 50 for 200 in the Family of *Merari*, Ver. 34.) nay, and the *Samaritan Copy* too, agree with the printed *Hebrew* here. To clear up this Difficulty then, we may recollect that there is a Distinction betwixt the *Priests* and *Levites*; and though both were descended from *Levi*, yet the Term of *Levites*, after *Aaron* and his Family were set apart for the *Priesthood*, does not include that Family, unless there are some particular Words to include it. It is to be observed further, that Verse 9th of this Chapter, the *Levites* were given to *Aaron* and his Sons, consequently the whole Number of the Tribe of *Levi* were above 22,000, for *Aaron* and his Sons must be distinct from the *Levites* that were given to them; and Ver. 46, were 22,000 in Number: So the 22,000 *Levites*, Ver. 36, where the Difficulty is thought to pinch so close, are the *Levites* exclusive of the *Priests*, or of *Aaron* and his Sons, as that Title generally, if not *always*, means. And if we look into *Jeph. xxi. 4, 5.* it appears that under the Title of

of *Aaron and his Sons*, is included the whole Family of *Amram*, of which *Aaron* was the First-born, and which therefore went by his Name ; and that they had thirteen Cities allowed them to dwell in ; we may very well therefore suppose that *Aaron and his Sons*, or those who ministered in the Priest's Office, were 40 Years before this, 300 in Number : And if we consider the vast Number of Offerings and Sacrifices which the Priests only were to offer to God, we shall be the readier to allow that there were more *Priests* than *Aaron* and his two Sons, who were the *chief Priests*. The three separate Numbers that make up 22,300, are all the Males of the whole Tribe of *Levi*, within the Ages specified ; but the 22,000, Ver. 29. are the *Levites* only ; “ *all that were number'd of the Levites by their Families* ;” not all that were number'd of all the Families of *Levi* ; for the Family of *Amram* of the Family of *Kobath*, were not reckoned to the *Levites*, but to *Aaron* ; and are called sometimes the Family of *Amram*, and sometimes *Sons of Aaron*, he being eldest Son of *Amram*, and Head of that Family. It is not expressly said that the Sons of *Aaron* or Family of *Amram*, who were mustered in the general Muster, were 300 ; but this follows by plain Inference, the *Levites* being but 22,000, while the Tribe of *Levi*, including the Priests, were 22,300. And this Account of the Matter will stand good, till it be proved that *Aaron and his Family, or Family of Amram*, are not included in the 8,600 that were numbered of the Family of *Kobath* ; or that the *Levites*, Ver. 39, included the Priests, to whom those *Levites* were given, and from whom they were distinguished by the Title of *Priests*. Every one must have observed the constant Distinction betwixt the *Priests* and the *Levites*, though both of the Tribe of *Levi*. And the not observing these two Particulars, obvious as they

hey lay; 1st, that the Priests were included in the 22,300: 2dly, that it is the *Levites* who are only 22,000, is what has raised this Objection against the Integrity of this Part of the *Hebrew Text*; and here indeed it is to the Credit of the *Samaritan* Scribe, and the Versions, that they have not pragmatically taken upon them to correct the Text, as they have done, the *Samaritan* especially, so often, and so injudiciously on other Occasions. And I hope, I may say, that there is a *Possibility* at least of *doubting* whether the two *Numerals* ۲ and ۱ have been mistaken for each other in this Place, because they never were here to be mistaken; and because such a Mistake would have made a *real*, not an *imaginary Contradiction* in the Text.

Numb. iii. 39, p. 411.

“ There are 15 Words which have a Dot over “ every Letter, the Reason of which seems “ clearly to be, that they were suspected of be- “ ing interpolated— לְאַהֲרֹן is so dotted here.”

This might be the Reason, or it might not. But if the Rabbins had *suspected* the Words, that is no Proof that they were interpolated, unless their *Suspicions, Acknowledgements*, and so forth, are to go for decisive Evidence. It is hardly to be imagined that *Moses* took so large a Muster by himself; and who so proper and so likely to assist him as *Aaron*?

Numb. xi. 15, p. 411.

“ We have the Pronoun *Fem.* תְּאַתָּה instead of “ the *Masc.* אַתָּה; and this even in the Speech “ of *Moses* to God himself—an Absurdity so “ great that the Reader scarce need be in- “ formed that it is peculiar to the *Hebrew* “ Text—an extravagant Mistake.”

The Reader scarce need be informed that so extravagant a Rant, and sanguine a Prejudice, against the Text, must arise from some uncommon Cause; and what else can we attribute it to but the Author’s

thor's Attachment to a Man who labouring under the *Arabico-Mania*, has all his Life-time been spitting his Venom on the *Hebrew*, depretingiate the Language of God and the Prophets ; setting up against it for Elegancy, Purity, and Perfection, the Language of Antichrist, which is a Compound perhaps of a hundred Languages, and rammed down the Throats of his Slaves by the Sword. *Oriental Learning* is an Honour to any Man ; but it must be that which grew in the Wildernes of *Kadeb*, not that of the Deserts of *Mecca*.

But to return to the *extravagaat Mistake* of **את** for **אתה**. Suppose we construe the Words, **אם נכת את עשה לך**, in another Manner, if it must be thus done to me, if I must be thus dealt with, as we should say, kill me ; I only propose this, to remove the mighty Offence. And perhaps the same Mistake, i *Sam.* xxiv. 19, may construe in the same Manner, and **את** before **הנדת** be of the same or like Import with the Word in two other Parts of the same Verse.

“ Thou hast rewarded me good, whereas I
 “ have rewarded thee evil ; **וְתָתַתְ** and *that*,
 “ **את הנדת** hast thou shewn to Day ; **את אשר** in
 “ that thou hast dealt well with me ; **את אשר**
 “ in that the Lord hath delivered me into
 “ thine Hand, and thou killedst me not.”

Here is **את** twice indisputably in this Verse used, as I suppose it to be *Numb.* xi. 15, above, and will construe in the same Manner a third Time ; and if it will do so, the Blot is removed from the Text, and must fall upon the *Samaritan Scribe*, and the *Pointers*, who did not understand it, as it stood. There are other Places where **את** is construed *thou*, Masc. and supposed to be writ for **אתה**, which will very well admit of **את** in its usual Sense, *it* or *that*, *the very* ; *Deut.* v. 27. *Go thou near and bear all that the Lord our God shall say, and **את** תדבר*

Speak it unto us ; **אַתْ כָּל** all that the Lord our God shall say unto us : So Ezek. xxviii. 14, **תִּחְנַן** a very anointed Cherub that covereth, even have I made thee : and Jer. xxxviii. 16, **אַתְּ אֲשֶׁר** is banished the Text, because they did not observe that it was emphatical there as in other Places, as *Jehovah liveth, who himself has given us this Breathing.*

The next Objection shews that the Author is too little acquainted with the Hebrew Text and Grammar to have undertaken a Work of this great Consequence, as settling what is the genuine Text ; though it seems not a little absurd to take this Method of trying what is *authentic*, and what not, when a *Record is to be tried by its external Evidence.*

Numb. xiii. 22, p. 412.

“ The Verbs that precede and follow **וַיָּבֹא**
 “ are all plural—should we not all agree that
 “ some Transcriber or Printer had mistaken ;
 “ if we were to read in *Cæsar’s Commentaries*
 “ —*ascenderunt, et exploraverunt et venit.*—”

But good Mr. Critick, is there no difference betwixt Hebrew and Latin, that you thus plow with an Ox and an Ass together to confound your Bible ? Put this into English—and *they went up and they searched, and came back and said*,—here is no Offence to Grammar or the Ear ; *Priscian’s Head* is safe here, but in danger from the Latin. When the Latin would have spoiled the Argument, p. 101. lin. 26, the English is appealed to, and here where the English spoils the Objection, the Latin is appealed to. But why so strong a Prejudice against the Text ? Any one who is ever so little conversant in Hebrew may observe that Hebrew Words are not declined as in Latin, but nearly as in English ; and the Gender, Number, and Voice, depend either upon the Context or Pronouns, which are sometimes affixed and sometimes not ; and very frequently the Sense runs as well without those Pronouns, to an English Ear,

as with them, thus in the Text objected to—*And they ascended by the South, and came unto Hebron—* and they came to the Brook and cut down—leave out or put in the *they*, it makes no difference in the Sense of the Passage, or Propriety of Language; and so it is in Hebrew. And the sing. Verb is not quite so absurd in the Hebrew Text, as it would have been in *Cæsar's Commentaries*: I have a great deal of Reason to think that this Gentleman must have heard that this had been shewn long ago. The Instances of *Verbs* used in this manner are too many to need citing; I shall refer to a few Passages where these and other pretended *Irregularities* occur together, *Isai. i. 6.* *They are not bound up with* **רְכָבָה** *Oil.* Ver. 12, *quis quæsivit hoc de manu vestra* **רְמַט** *concavat atria mea.* Ver. 15. **לَا חָבְשׂוּ** *non ego* audivit. Ver. 23, *tby* *Princes* **כָּלָו** *all of him,* **אֶחָבָה** *loveth Gifts,* and **רְדָף** *followeth after Rewards;* the Fatherles **לֹא יִשְׁפְּטוּ** *they judge not.* Ch. ii. 11. *Oculi elati hominis humiliabitur.* Ver. 17. **וְשָׁחַנְבָּהוֹת** *Ch. v. 26.* *Gentes* cito *levis veniet.* Ver. 29. We have three singular Verbs together that are all false Concords according to *Lilly*. One need but open almost at random and read a Chapter or two to see how little Regard the inspired Writers paid to the Rules of the *Latin Grammar.* And our Author would do well to look a little more narrowly into the *Hebrew Text* as it stands, and the *Nature of the Hebrew Grammar*, before he thus *hunts for the pretious Life, like an Arabian in the Wilderness,* filling the whole sacred Volume with such Blunders and Corruptions as *una litura* only can correct. The Mistakes if they are Mistakes in the Pronouns **דֹּוָא**, and **הָם** under the next Head of Complaint, with this against the *Verbs*, amount to an incredible Number alone.

Numb. xxvii. 7, p. 413, and 414.

“ Two Pronouns which respect the Daughters
“ of Zelopbead are found *Masculine*—con-
“ trary to common Sense and Consistency.”

I have observed that the Distinctions of *Verb* and *Noun*, as we call them in *Latin* are unknown in *Hebrew*; but that the grammatical Variations are made by Pronouns, which often stand single, but most frequently are affixed, and then they are contracted for conveniency; thus **הָמָה** is a *Multitude*, and as a plural Pronoun *them*, often stands single; and so does **הָנָה** in much the same Sense; and when affixed sometimes retain two Letters, and sometimes one only; **הָמָ** or **מָ**, and **הָנָ** or **נָ** alone; and generally the *Plurality* of the Nouns is made by adding **מָ**, the **הָ** being supplied by **וֹ**, as it often is on other Occasions; and sometimes **מָ** alone makes the plural Number. And as no Reason can be given why **הָמָה** a *Multitude*, *many*, *they*, may not be *common* as to Gender, so we find it as well as **הָנָה**, used both Ways; and though the first be oftener *masculine* than the other, as it is oftener used, yet are there so many Instances of their Usage in common, whether affixed to *Verbs* or *Nouns*, that *common Sense and Consistency* may admit the promiscuous Use of them in this Verse, as they are used again, *Josb.* xvii. 4. with respect to these same Daughters of Zelopbead; and *Josbua* gave **לְהָמָ** to *them* an *Inheritance* among the *Breibren* **אֲבִיהָן** of their Father. **הָמָ** is Fem. twice more in this very Chapter of *Numbers*, Ver. 14. **הַסְמִ** *isiae aquæ*, Ver. 17. like *Sheep* **לְהָמָ** which have no *Sheperd*; and Gen. xxxiii. 15. *thirty-two Milch Camels and their Colts*: And so it is in the *Samaritan Text*, in these Places and others, though that be appealed to, to make it evident that the Text is printed wrong, Ver. 7, of this Chapter. Did the Gentleman know that **שָׁמָ** was Fem. in

the

the Samaritan Code, as well as חם in the Hebrew ; and would he pass it over in Silence, only to set the better Face upon his Objection ; why else was this picked out of many others to find fault with ? I may remark here that we have the masculine Plural חם, Feminine in רחלים גמלים ; ewes ; as it is in נשים women, &c. &c. I shall leave these Remarks to the more mature Consideration of the Author, and proceed to

Numb. xxxv. 4, p. 549.

“ The 1000 Cubits round about in this Verse,
“ it is certain from the next were 2000 ori-
“ ginally, p. 549.”

One would think from the different Wording of these two Verses, that something different was meant. The 4th Verse says—from the Wall of the City outward a thousand Cubits round about. The 5th—ye shall measure without the City on the East Side two thousand Cubits, and so on the other three Sides, and the City in the midst ; this shall be to them the Suburbs of their Cities. The Contents therefore of these out-grounds were 2000 Cubits by 1000, of the Land next adjoining to the Walls of the City ; and they would lay in four Parellelograms on the four Sides of the City ; one towards each Quarter of the Heavens. On each Side of the City, a thousand Cubits outward from the Wall by two Thousand Eastward, Southward, Westward, and Northward. And I fancy that Dr. Wall, as cited by our Author, did not understand the Text, any more than himself, which made it necessary to correct the Reading. By this Disposition of the Out-grounds for Suburbs, which were for their Cattle and Servants, there were four Openings or Entries in the City, between each of the Parellelograms one, the City being in the midst.

Deut. xx. 19, p. 415.

“ Obscure and probably corrupted Place.”

The Words are—when thou shalt besiege a City a long Time, in making War against it, thou shalt not destroy the Trees thereof by forcing an Ax against them; for thou mayst eat of them, and thou shalt not cut them down [כִּי הָרָם עַז הַשְׁדָה for the Trees of the Field are vegetable Matter] to employ them in the Siege. Men live by the Fruits of the Ground, and the Vine, Fig-tree, Olive, and Pomegranate, were the Trees of the Field spoke of, and their chief Support: And they are forbid to cut them down to use in a Siege, because they are **הָרָם** Vegetable, what Man consists of, **אָרָם** is the vegetable Mould, and the Trees collect and form the vegetable Mould for our Use, and are composed of it themselves, and so are as much **אָרָם**, as the first Man, who was named so, *Adam*, because taken from the *Adame*: And the Reason why they should not cut them down to use in a Siege, in that they are *Adam*, composed of the same Substance that Man is, and so his proper Nourishment, is plain to any one who considers the *ideal Meaning* of the Word; and it is probable this Place is not corrupted.

Deut. xxii. 19.

“ The Word **נָעָרָה** occurs 22 Times in the Pentateuch, and is not once printed properly but in this Place.—” p. 415.

I suppose the Gentleman means that **נָעָר** occurs 21 Times where the Word should have been **נָעָרָה**; for **נָעָרָה** occurs but once. His first Argument for a Corruption here is the *Punctuation*, which having placed a *Kametz* under the now last Letter, **ר**,

“ an **ה** must have followed when the Point was first subjoined to that Letter,”

but as *must*, is only *say so*, I deny the Consequence, and think, that as the Pointers knew it was used to a *young Person* of the female Sex, as it certainly is, they pointed the Word, as if the sacred Writer had said *young Woman*, instead of what he does say, a *Youth*,

Youth, or young Person; for נער does signify *Youth*, or *a Youth*, without any Regard to Distinction of Sex. And if the Word had not been misconstrued, it had never been suspected of being corrupted. *Juvenis* and *juventus* in *Latin*, as *Youth* in *English*, are used in this Manner; though I think we most generally apply *Youth* to a Person of the male Sex; the *Hebrews* to either Sex. This is another Instance, among the many, where a Passage is supposed to be corrupted, because not understood. It is true that נער is not a *young Woman*; but then it is not true that *Youth* may not mean a *young Woman*. The rabbinical Solutions of such pretended Difficulties, which our Author so often entertains his Reader with, are too ridiculous to waste Time and Paper with.

We are now come to a difficult Passage that has perplexed Commentators indeed; the Sense of which our Author thinks with F. *Houbigant* is greatly disturbed by *corrupted Words*; and many Corrections are proposed in the Course of his Dissertation upon it; but I hope to shew that the Text is right, and makes the best Sense as it stands, without altering so much as one, *Jod*, or borrowing one & *Aleph*. The Words are,

וּבְשִׁלְתָּה הַיּוֹצֶת מִבֵּין רֶגֶלִיהָ 57. Deut. xxviii. וּבְבִנְיהָ אֲשֶׁר תָּלֶד.

The Translation, though Arbitrary is scarce Sense or Consistent; I shall substitute another, and endeavour to justify it,—*The tender and delicate Woman*—and she shall dress, [for Food,] that which faints at her Feet, even of her own Children *which she shall bear*; for *she shall eat them for want of all Things, secretly in the Siege*. The preceding Verses tell us in general; first, that they should eat the Fruit of their own Body; then, that the Husband should cast an evil Eye on his nearest Relations, his Wife, and his Brother, and the Remnant of his

Children, that should remain, as feeding his ravening Appetite upon them in fancy; and should grudge also his Wife and remaining Children the Flesh of those of his Children he should kill for Food in the Extremity of Hunger; next, *the tender and delicate Woman—her Eye shall be evil towards the Husband of her Bosom, and towards her Son and towards her Daughter*, then follow the Words in dispute, *and shall dress, &c.* Hunger makes her cast her wifful Eyes on her Husband and Children to seize them for Food; and the Extremity of Famine drives her to the dreadful unnatural Resource of dressing her own Children wasted and scorched up, and fainting at her Feet.

What an astonishing Scene of Distress have we here? No Nation had ever experienced those glorious Displays of Power and Mercy in their Favour as this People had: And none ever drank deeper of the Wrath of God; in their best Days they were really the best of Men; in their Corruption none so bad. Their Sin was beyond that of *Sodom*, and their Punishment bore a just Proportion. Famine, one of the necessary Evils attending a long Siege, is here described in its most frightful Colours. Children fainting for Hunger, burnt up with Thirst, and falling at their Parents Feet, who deaf to their pitiful Moans seize them for Food for themselves. The tenderest of the Affections, even in the most tender of the tenderest Sex, turns into Fury; and the fond Mother takes the Infant from her Bosom, and the Child panting at her Feet, and dresses it in Secret to secure the Delicacy to herself; and ravening Hunger makes her grudge even her Husband and the rest of her Children a Share.—The blood runs cold at the Thought, and if Experience had not verified the Truth of it, one would have thought it was the Orator, and not the Prophet that drew the deep affecting Scene.

בשלה. The first Word in dispute; it is construed *secundinae*, or after-birth, in the Margin, and *young one*, in the Text, without any Authority for it: It comes regularly from **בשֶׁל** to dress, whether in or out of Water, as the Sun does the Fruits of the Earth for Food. It is here the 3d Person Feminine, the **ה** being supplied by **ו**, as in **עשִׁיתָה** from **עָשָׂה**; the 2d Person Masculine, and 3d Person Feminine; is in all the Verbs the same. Or if the Word be a Noun Subst. **בשלה** in Regim. **בשלה** her *Drest-meat*, Dainties, or *Feast*, shall be of that which dies at her Feet, and even of her own Children, the Sense will come to the same.

it is not **וַיָּצַא** *what comes out*, but what is *burnt up*, scorched, dried, withered away with Hunger and Thirst at her Feet. She shall take this helpless wasted Infant from between her Feet, where it had fainted with Hunger; its Head dropping upon her Lap. And this is what is said, *Cb. xxxii. 24. Burnt with Hunger, and devoured with Burning-heat*, and recorded as fulfilled. *Lam. ii. 11, 12, 20. the Children and the Sucklings swoon in the Streets of the City; they say to their Mothers where is Corn and Wine—when their Soul was poured out into their Mothers Bosom—the Women eat their Fruit; their Arm-children, as **עֲוָלִי** **טְפֵחִים**, I presume means, and not Children of a Span long; Children yet in the Hand.*

וּבְבִנָּה, even among her own Children; and **ב** is used here as it is *Numb. xv. 11.* either for a *Lamb* among the *Sheep*, or **בְּעֵזִים** among the *Goats*, i. e. from among.

This Construction, I think keeps clear of the Objections to the present Interpretation of these Words; and I flatter myself will be thought such as the Rules of Grammar will bear; and if so, we have no Occasion for the *Pruning-knife*: And I may have a Right to transfer that particular Honour

now done to the Bodleian MS. over to the *Masoretic Text*, which appears to have the best Title to it: And some Honour is also due to the *ignorant Corrector*, who put the *little crooked Beth* over *וּבְנִיהָ*, it being charitably done of him, and *judiciously*; for it is not Sense without.

Deut. xxxiii. 1—5. p. 422. “these Verses being
“ remarkably unintelligible—”
or rather misunderstood; a new Translation, but not Correction, of the Text may be necessary; which I shall attempt, and submit to the Scrutiny; premising that the Words relate to that glorious Manifestation of God to the Children of *Israel* in the Cloud, or that awful and terrible Whirlwind, Tempest, Darkness, Thickness of Darkness, with the devouring Flames of Fire, like those at the Sun rolling in perpetual Circulation, burning within it. This Cloud attended the Children of *Israel* from their first Departure out of *Egypt*, upon all extraordinary Occasions, during all their Wandrings in the Wilderness. At *Horeb*, which took its Name from the great Fire, which struck such a Terror into them; it rested during the giving of the Law. And as it frequently rested upon the Mountains they coasted along, the several Places where it made its Stands, were named either *now*, or prophetically *before*; or were proper Names to record the glorious Appearance it made.

1. “ This is the Blessing wherewith *Moses*,
“ the Man of God, blessed the Children of
“ *Israel* before his Death. And he said,
2. “ *Jehovah* came from *Sinai*, and his Light
“ arose at *Seir*; [Tempest] he shined out at
“ Mount *Paran* [Glory] and came forth at
“ *Rabbath Kadesh* [the Majesty, holy, se-
“ parate, or unapproachable,] on his Right-
“ hand was the Fire placed by him.

3. "Wrath enveloped the Nations ; all their
"holy Ones were in thine Hand : Yea,
"they were smitten down at thy Feet,
"were destroyed at thy Word.
4. "Moses gave him a Law, the Subject of
"Thoughts of the Congregation of Jacob :
5. "And he was King in *Jesburun*, over the
"Congregation of the Heads of the Peo-
"ple ; the Assembly of the Rulers [*Scep-*
"terers] of *Israel*."

A few Remarks will be necessary to justify this Translation, and remove some Objections : The Names of the several Places given them from the Appearance of God in Glory and Majesty upon them, are agreeable to the constant Custom of changing the Names, if not before suitable, and conforming them to the Occasion or Matter to be recorded. Most, if not all, of these Places bore these expressive Names before God now displayed his Glory upon them ; and were very possibly prophetically given, as many other Names were before and since.

The first Correction proposed by Mr. *Kennicott* is of מְרִיבַת for מְרִבַּת ; but the present seems to be the better Reading, because if the Evidence for both Words were equal, which it by no means is ; yet the Context pleads for it, all the other Places bearing Names suitable to the *Majesty* that appeared at them. The Wilderness of *Kadesh* was no small Tract of Ground, and there were many Names to different Parts of it. Mr. *Kennicott* thinks that this is the Place which is called *Meribab*, *Numb. xx. 6.* in the Desert of *Zin*, for which he has no Proof ; and if they were the same, it was no uncommon Thing to conform a Name, by altering a Letter, to some Thing worthy Remembrance. The Glory of the Lord appeared at *Meribab*, and it did so at many other Places not mentioned here.

Another

Another Alteration is of אָוֶר for רְתַת. But some Word more proper to the Action of Fire might have been pitched on rather than one that is appropriated to another Condition of the Heavens. The Fire, and Light, and their Actions, are distinct Things.

But רְתַת it seems is *Chaldee*, and never used in any Book writ before the Captivity; nor is it acknowledged by the Greek and Syriack Versions, though it is by the Samaritan Text; and the Greek says, *the Angels at his Right-hand, the Angels with him*; which shews they knew what the Words meant, though they did not dare perhaps in *Egypt*, to give a literal Version of them, for the Fire, and Cloud, with the Light that irradiated from it, are the *Host of Heaven*, or the *Angels or Agents*, the Text speaks of, as *Ps. civ. 4. Who maketh the Winds his Angels, or Agents, and his Ministers* לְהַט *was the flaming Fire*; this is the Fire spoke of above; and this is the Fire which the Cherubim were set up in Effigie at *Eden*, in the Tabernacle and Temple, and called their Chariot—*Gen. iii. ult. the flaming Fire rolling in upon itself*. It is the Host of Heaven that are the Angels *by him on his Right-hand*, and who were placed there to shew his Superiority over them; that having been the Contest in *Egypt*, whether *Jehovah* or the Heavens were supreme. But רְתַת is not found in any Book writ before the Captivity; it is however used as a Hebrew Word where it is found, and that in many Places. רְתַת a Witness, is but once used, and yet allowed to be a Hebrew Word; and if רְתַת as a Noun, be a Law, Statute, or Appointment, as a Participle it is something appointed, set, placed; and in this Sense it is almost self-evidently used, *Gen. xxxi. 47*, in that compound Name אַשְׁרְדוֹתָה—שָׁהַד—רְתַת *testis, statuti, תָּהַרְתָּה termini*, which is the Interpretation *Laban* himself puts upon it,

it, and he must speak *Hebrew*, because there was then no other Language in being, as this and the other Names given by *Laban* to the *Heap of Stones* are full Proof of. And if this be the Sense of קָרְנִים the meaning of the Words translated a *Fire of Law*, will be that the Fire stood as a Servant attending at his Hand: So *Hab.* iii. 4. קָרְנִים the *Shiners*. מִידּוֹ לֹן at his Hand by him, waiting in Attendance. *The Lord sitting on his Throne, and all the Host of Heaven standing by him on his Right-band and on his left*, *1 Kings xxii. 19*. These קָרְנִים are perhaps מְאוֹרִים the Agents of Brightness, of Light; the several Streams that flow from the Orbs and give Light to us, *Ezek. xxxii. 8*. *Moses* and the other Prophets describe God with the same Equi-page and glorious Attendance. The Ode of *Hab-bakuk* is a truly sublime one; in which *Jebovah* is described as coming forth in Judgment against *Judea*, and all the neighbouring Countries, whose Measure of Iniquity being full, *Nebucbadnezzar* is raised up as the Rod in the Hand of God, and *Je-bovah* comes forth in Power and great Glory, as in War against them: All Nature trembles before him, the Mountains shake, and with their Altars upon them bow themselves at his Feet: The Rivers, their symbolical Divinities, are dried up: The Sun and Moon, so long the Rivals of God, stand abashed at his Presence, stop in their Career, and then flee before him: The Nations, their Worshippers, are scattered like Chaff, and nothing can abide the Majesty of his Presence, whose Brightness eclipsed the Heavens, and filled the Earth with its Glory. The Translations have not made Sense of a great Part of it, which perhaps may be owing to many corrupted Words; for what is not understood, is certainly unintelligible, and should be altered into what may be understood. The Beginning of this illustrious Ode is parallel, or remarkably similar to that

that of *Moses*; but not so much the same, that because אֹור is in one, it must be in the other: And surely the least Appearance is sufficient to determine the Point when the Text is to be corrupted. May I not from the Similarity of these Passages argue by the same Rule, that *Habbakuk's* is corrupted, because he doth not mention *Sinai* and *Meribah*, and puts *Timan* for *Seir*? There are vast Numbers of Places in Scripture which refer to this glorious Manifestation of the Power and Majesty of God, which was always in a Cloud, called by many Names, as his *Secret-place*, *Pavillion*, חַבֵּיָן Hiding-place, [[God being only visible to Man by this Glory in the Cloud, or *Darkness*,] which last Word Mr. *Kennicott* with great Judgment, upon his own Authority and a *Samaritan* Word, changes into *Manifestation*, the reverse of what the Prophet says, for fear, I suppose, this great Fire should not be seen through a Cloud, and God were *visibly*, and not *secretly* there. There are many other Names for this Cloud, inter. al. צְבָא Strength; it being a Specimen of the Powers of this System, the Sun in the Center, extending its Rays, Brightness, and Glory, upwards in a Sphere; bound in and surrounded with thick Darkness, or condensed Air: And amidst all the various Descriptions of this Glory, not two are in the same Words. And I hope these of *Moses's* and *Habbakuk's* may be both construed without such monstrous Liberties taken with the Words, and without the Help of the *Samaritan*, *Chaldee*, or *Arabic* Metamorphoses.

To proceed,

“Wrath enveloped the Nations.” חַבֵּב occurs no where else but here; but is derived from חַב or חַבָּה to *bide, conceal, cover over*. Jerem. xlix. 10. *I have made Esau bare, I have uncovered his secret Places, and he shall not be able נַחֲבָה to bide himself, by covering himself over, in Opposition*

sition to his being stript and uncovered. This Expression is equivalent to that of *pouring out Wrath upon them*, which frequently occurs ; and wants no further Comment when we recollect what was done in *Egypt*, and the other Nations just conquered by *Moses*. Wrath, like a Sea, having over-whelmed, and swallowed them up : And Wrath then hung over many other Nations, those of *Canaan* especially.

— “ כָּל קָרְשֵׁי בַּידְךָ omnes sancti ejus in manu tua—if ever a Line wanted Illustration, we have such a one now before us,” p. 431. and therefore it is to be mangled and new made—but the Words are plain enough as they stand in a literal Translation—all their holy Ones were in thy Hand, brought under thine Hands, or subjected to thy Power : Their First-born were slain, their Gods conquered, their sacred Emblems of Gold and Silver given up to the *Israelites*, and worn in Triumph by their Children. *Exod. xii. 12.* *I will smite all their First-born both of Man and Beast* [their Priests and sacred Animals] *and against all the Gods of Egypt I will execute Judgment* ;

—yea they were smitten down at thy Feet, were destroyed at thy Word.

חַכּוֹ I derive from נִכָּה, as some, says *M. de Cal.* do and construe it *percussu*, which is a common Word in Scripture for destroying an Enemy, נִשָּׁא or נִשָּׁאָה is another Word used to the same Purpose : But then here wants the י suffixed to make it *Plural* ; but it is wanting also in so many other Instances, that the want of it here need give us no Uneasiness.

— *Moses gave him a Law*—

Who is meant here? why, *Jacob*, in the latter Part of the Sentence. See *Glossius Canon 11. Aliquando relativum respicit ad consequens*, as *Numb. xxiv. 17.* *I shall see him but not now* :—*there shall come a Star, &c.*

&c. And I construe מִרְשָׁה, which simply is a Possession, as referring to the Mind, *the Subject of the Thoughts*; what the Mind should take hold of, as the Word is used Job. xvii. 11. what they were to meditate on Day and Night.

There are two minute Objections to be removed before I proceed. 1st, This makes Moses speak of himself in the 3d Person, which

“ is very improbable—” p. 433.

though he always speaks of himself in the 3d Person without Exception; as much as if he had not been the Writer of the History.

“ — And as the Pronoun **לְנוּ nobis** occurs in

“ the same Line, it seems impossible;”

but if the Pronoun relate to Jacob—*he gave to him, sc. to Jacob*, this Difficulty vanishes.

2dly. But further, *Moses* was not King, which the printed Text makes him: *be rather disclaimed* the Title—true, but not the Power in the Assembly of the Elders; for there it was necessary, as their Lawgiver, for him to claim and exercise it, which he did do. And there is but little Occasion to make one Transcriber write the Word wrong, and the next that came after him, though he found out the Mistake, to *insert both the proper and improper Word*. I believe the Reader will think, when he has duly considered this Passage of *Moses*, that neither the *Samaritan* or *Syrian*, upon whose Authority we are to mangle it in the most daring Manner imaginable, knew what they were about; and that our Author has been rather too forward in so rashly following such blind Guides. And perhaps the Author argues no where more fondly and weakly than he does in this Part of his Work; but I will not pursue Criticisms, (*if they merit the Name of Criticisms*) founded upon the Blunders of others, and mistaken Sense of the Words they are to banish from the Text.

Josh. vi. 7, instead of vi. 6. p. 438.

‘אמָרוּ’ must be wrong here, because *Joshua* is the Speaker.

Joshua the Son of Nun called the Priests, and said unto them, take up the Ark—and אָמָרוּ they said unto the People pass on, and compass the City: Which only makes *Joshua* speak to the People by the Priests, or some other proper Persons; for they said may not refer to the Priests, but those whose Business it was to convey the Orders of the General to the Army. It cannot be supposed that *Joshua* could speak loud enough for the whole Army to hear him at once; or that he went from Tent to Tent, from Place to Place, to give Directions in his own Person; nor does the Text, which says *he spake to the People*, imply any such Thing. It is sufficient if he sent his Orders by the proper Officers, whom אָמָרוּ may refer to, without their being mentioned; as *הָנִיד אמר* and so often stand alone, when it is not necessary to say who was the Speaker—one said—one told, when one only was the Speaker; and they said, when there were many, as in this Case there undoubtedly were, *Josh. x. 22, &c.* furnishes us with several parallel Instances to this—they brought out—so did they, and the like.

I pity poor *Leusden*, who is unfortunately fallen into the Hands of one so much his Superior in Judgment and Learning; but heartily congratulate the Makers out of many Meanings, when one of the most profoundly judicious Critics of the Age finds it so difficult to make out one Meaning*.

Josh. x. 24. הַהֲלֹכֹת.

“ The Existence of this נ seems entirely owing
“ to the Mistake of some Arabian Transcri-
“ ber—”

G

who

* Had he [Leusden] lived in these Days, he had been a celebrated Maker out of many Meanings; for if he had failed in spiritual Senses, he would in full Proportion have excelled in Literal, p. 438.

who dropt out of the Clouds, and having transcribed one Copy, carried all the rest away with him, and has never been heard of since. Suppose we were to derive the Word from **חלך** and **כאה** ; **חלך** from **חל** and **כח** ; and **כאה** from **הלך** as **הלך** is from **חל** and **כח** ; and **כח** from **כח** ; see Buxt.—*Joshua*—said unto the Captains of the Men of War **ההלוּכוֹא** that went to the war with him ; **כאה** signifying *attero, contero, &c.* If the Sense will do, we shall have no Trouble with its being in the singular Number, there being Authorities enough to support it.

Josh. xv. 47, p. 439.

“ The true Reading **הנְזִיל** is found MSS.

“ 2, 5, and &c.”

The Epithet of *Great* often goes with **הַיָּם** *Sea*, meaning the *Mediterranean* ; but there were other large Waters called *Seas*, the Sea of *Tiberias*, &c. **גְּבֵל** *Gibel* *Psal. lxxxiii. 8.* is coupled with *Ammon*, who had a City called the *City of Waters* : And this Sea of **גְּבֵל** might be the *Sea* here meant ; which with the Territories of *Gibel* came to the Lot of *Judah*. However if there was a Country named *Gibel*, as there certainly was, it might have a Body of Water in it called a *Sea* ; and **גְּדוֹל** may not be the true Reading, though it is taken for granted.

Josh. xviii. 12, 14, 19.

Here we have a grammatical Complaint or two, but no Reasons offered in Support of them. **הַיָּה** should be **חִי** ; and **חַצְאָתִי** should be it seems **חַזְאָתִי**, though it occurs, I think, but twice with, to 30 Times without the *Vau* ; but I leave Grammar to another Hearing, when the Nature of it may be a little more enquired into.

Josh. xxi. 36, 37, p. 440.

“ We have here the most convincing Proof

“ of the Fallibility of a Jewish Transcriber,

“ and of the Imperfection of the Masora—

“ The Transcriber and his Rule have failed.”

In what? in representing the Case fairly as they found it? No antient MSS. retained these two Verses, says the *Masora*; and it is two Hundred Years afterwards before we hear of any MSS. that had inserted them. *Kimchi* 500 Years ago, says, “no antient MS. **מְרוּק** that was *correct*, that be “*bad seen*, retained them.” But some there were then that did, of what Antiquity we know not, nor from what Quarter they were. To set a Face upon this Objection, and make it look a little plausible against the present Text, *Kimchi* is made to say, *he never found them in any antient MS. corrected by the Masoretic Standard*: And p. 443, these Verses are supposed to have been *erased* in some Copies, and excluded others by *Masoretic Authority*, which you are to take upon the Author’s Word.

I would not be thought, were I ever so conversant in their Writings, to be an Advocate for those of this Set of Men, but would obviate the ill, and I think unwarrantable, Use made of this *Masoretic Omission*; neither their Care or Fidelity being from hence to be called in Question, but rather both to be commended: For had they made any material Alterations without the Authority of antient MSS. on their own Judgment, and by the Rules of *sound Criticism* [which thank God were reserved to this enlightened Age], and others had followed their Example, by this Time the Scripture had been lost, in the Confusion of *learned Emendations*, and *necessary Corrections*. How there came to be no antient MS. above 700 Years ago, that had retained these two Verses, is indeed a Wonder; but unless the *Masora* can be convicted of a Falsehood here, their Care and Fidelity are to be commended, and not their MSS. charged with the Omission. They found this Omission, they did not make it, and no other MSS. have been produced since of greater Antiquity to confute them: And our Author

charging them with the Fault, only shews he did not consider the true State of the Case ; or that he is partial enough to make the *Masorites* answser for other Peoples Faults. And indeed the Author prosecutes the present *Hebrew* Text with uncom-mon Inveteracy, almost Malice prepense ; but I hope to see a better Understanding between them by and by. It is above 700 Years ago since the *Masora* was published, which was a Collection of all their Criticisms on the Text for 1000 Years before ; see Dean *Prideaux*'s Account of the *Masora* ; and Ben *Asher*, and Ben *Napthali*, who about the Year of *Christ* 1040, published their Editions of the *Hebrew* Scriptures, have been the Standard, the one to the *Eastern*, the other to the *Western* Jews, ever since. It doth not appear that either of them made any Alteration in the Text from the Copies they had before, though they then settled, and published, that *accursed Thing* of Punctuation, which answered all their Purposes, without altering a Letter of the Text. And we are assured they did not corrupt the Text, from the Quarrel that arose be-tween them about, not the *Letters or Words*, but the *Points* only, as before cited from Bishop *Wal-ton*'s *Polyglott*.

Job. xxii. 34, p. 444.

Here is Correction upon Correction proposed, which are *very necessary*, because we are resolved to demolish the Text. The Words as they stand, run thus :

“ And the Children of *Reuben*, and the Chil-
“ dren of *Gad*, called the Altar ; but a Wit-
“ ness it, between us that *Jebovah Aleim* is ;”
i. e. that *Jebovah Aleim* was between them, their
common God ; that they had a Share and Title,
with the rest of *Israel* in *Jebovah Aleim*. Look to
what passes between them, and the Messengers from
the other Tribes beyond *Jordan*, and we shall soon

see the Propriety of this Name, and Truth of its Explication, *Ver. 24—27.*

“ And if we have not done it out of *Solicitude, and on purpose*, saying in Time to “ come, your Children might speak to our “ Children ; saying, what have you to do “ with Jehovah the Aleim of Israel—there- “ fore we said, let us now prepare to build us “ an Altar, not for Burnt-offering, nor for “ Sacrifice, but a *Witness*—that your Chil- “ dren may not say to our Children in Time “ to come, *ye have no Part in Jebovab.*”

And they appeal to the Pattern of the Altar, which they built, not for Sacrifice, *Ver. 28.* **כִּי יְהוָה הוּא** but a *Witness*, that they might not be excluded from the Service of God at his Altar, and be told they had no Share in *Jebovab* the *Aleim* ; for this Reason they named the Altar ; but a *Witness* that *Jebovab Aleim* was between them. They no less than three Times before call it but a *Witness* ; the but implying it was not for *Sacrifice*, but only for a *Witness*. And it was a *Witness* by its Form that the Altar of God on the other Side *Jordan* was between them and the rest of the Tribes ; that they had a Share in *Jebovab*. The Altar was not designed for a *Witness*, that the *Lord was God*, but that they had a Share in the *Lord God*. So they explain themselves over and over again ; and so the Nature of the Transaction bespeaks itself ; and therefore the **נִזְנָן**, which our Author would fetch from *1 Kings xviii. 39*, is highly improper here. How profoundly judicious is that rigid Judge of the printed Hebrew Text, and what a keen Puzzler of plain Words ! to speak in the Language and Spirit of the Critick. The Greek Version has taken the Sense of the Name given to the Altar, as explained above—a *Witness* that the *Lord God* is theirs : And the Faults which want correcting here are not in the

Transcriber of the Text, but the Interpreter, which we have often, and shall often again find to be the Case.

Josb. xxiv. 30, p. 445.
 We read here that *Joshua* was buried in *Timnab-Serab* סְרָה; but *Jud. ii. 9*, that it was at *Timnath-Hares* חֲרֵם; and we are to conclude that Chance or Ignorance has turned חֲרֵם *ar se versa*, as much as if *Blenheim* near *Woodstock* in one Page, should be writ *Blenmeib* in the next. But the Cases are not quite parallel; Hebrew are not arbitrary unmeaning Names like our Modern ones; and if Mar. de *Cal.* construes סְרָה right by *Fætor* and *Superfluitas*: The Reason of this Change of Name will be obvious, the one being the *Image of the Sun*, the other of the *stinking Thing*, which as an Object of Worship it most certainly was. The Places most of them retained the Names the Heathens had given them after they came into the Possession of *Israel*; but some they thought proper to change, and yet they might sometimes be called by their old Names. חֲרֵם is the *Solar-fire*, which the Heathens worshipped; and סְרָה a Word perhaps of Contempt, that Place was called by, considered as a Place of Worship, by Believers. Something very like this we have in *Jerubbaal* the Son of *Gideon*, who *2 Sam. xi. 21*, is called by *David* *Jerub-besheth*; בָּעֵל as an Object of Worship, being in *David's* Opinion בְּשַׁת a shameful Thing, unless our Author chuses to say it is owing to the Carelessness of the Transcriber, who having writ יְרֵב, casts his Eye accidentally upon the Line below, and seeing נְשָׁת, which he mistook for בְּשַׁת, the בּ and בְּ being similiar Letters, and often mistaken one for the other, he writes יְרֵבְשָׁת for יְרֵבָל, which having been fastened to the Text by *Masoretic Authority*, has been espoused by credulous *Christians* ever since. Examples of this kind you meet with many

of our Author's discovering, p. 370, though this has escaped him.

Jud. i. 22.

“ Instead of בֵּית Camb. MS. 1. has בְּנִי,
“ which seems to be the better Reading, be-
“ cause of חַטָּא and עַלְוָה in the Plural Num-
“ ber,” p. 445.

Though in the very next Line it is בֵּית יָמָם, with a plural Verb; and a Noun of Number as is, according to the strictest Rules of Grammar will admit of a plural Verb; yet the other is the better Reading; but by what Rule he judges so I am quite at a loss to guess, and wish we had been favoured with the Criterion.

Jud. xvi. 13, 14, p. 475.

“ Eighteen Words are omitted, as is evident
“ from the Greek Version;”
that is, the Greek turned back into Hebrew again, would require eighteen Words more; which in the present Text are sufficiently implied.

“ And Delilah said unto Sampson—tell me
“ wherewith thou mightst be bound, and he
“ said unto her, if thou weave the seven
“ Locks with the Web; and she fastened
“ them with the Pin, and said unto him the
“ Philistines be upon thee Sampson, and he
“ awaked out of his Sleep, &c.

What is there deficient here? What is not expressed speaks itself.

Jud. xvi 18.

“ הַ has been assimilated to לְהַ just before
“ it,” p. 446.

It is only supposing that the Message she sent was, come up to your Servant, which was the usual Phrase; and the Words may very well stand as they do, as a numerical Part of the Message she sent—for he has shewn her all his Heart: Or suppose the Words spoke by the Messenger in his own Name,

and this mighty Trifle will not be worth correcting.

Jud. xx. 13, p. 446.

“ MSS. 2, 4, 20, read בְּנִי in the Blank,
“ where the *Points* of a Word are without
“ any Letters.”

The Blank, I suppose, was left for the *Points*; but בְּנִי is not wanting here, because בְּנִימִין is as often without בְּנִי before it, perhaps as with; and the Addition, or Omission, makes no Alteration in the Sense.

Ruth. i. 8, 9, 11, 13, 19.

“ In these Verses the Pronouns are surprisingly
“ corrupted.”

And so they are in a surprising Number of other Places; if their being used as of the common Gender is a Proof of the Corruption. See *Jud. xix. 24. Exod. i. 2, and Numb. xxxv. Ver. 6, 7*, which grow so near some other Mistakes that have been just pointed out, that it is a Wonder these were not seen at the same Time. I would not willingly insult common Sense, by defending real Mistakes; but cannot help saying, that the Author himself almost insults common Sense by so often citing such despicable Nonsense, as the only *Vindication*, for so I imagine, he would have it thought, that there is of these supposed Mistakes.

Ruth. iii. 3, p. 447.

The Complaint here is against two Verbs in the 2d Person Fem. of the *preter Tense*, being expressed with a ' at the End.—*Put thy Raiment upon thee, and get thee down to the Floor.*

But they are not Verbs of the *preter Tense*, but of the *imperative Mood*; and there is another Instance in the next Verse, וְשַׁכְּבֵת, and *lay thee down*, speaking to *Ruth*; and the 2d Person Fem. in that Mood, is almost always softned with a ': Instances of which are almost without Number. There are near

near Thirty in this short Book of *Ruth*; ten in a Chapter in others, and three in a Verse. Let the Reader turn to the Places where the Discourse is to Women, *Gen. xvi. 24, 30, 35. Exod. ii. 8, 9. Jud. iv. 8, 19. 2 Sam. xiii. 1 Kings xiv. 2 Kings iv, &c.* and not only the *Verbs* but *Pronouns* likewise are softened with a ' when speaking to them. *1 Kings xiv. 2.* 'את' for אַתָּה, 'את' for לֹכֶד. and for זֶה, thrice; *2 Kings iv. 4, and 7, Elijah* speaking to the Widow of one of the Sons of the Prophets; and *Ver. 22,* the *Shunamite's* Husband to her, *wherefore אַתָּה הָלַכְתִּי goest thou?* These are Instances enough to build a Rule upon: And it cannot be said, that these *Verbs*, *ירדָתִי, שָׁכַבָּתִי, שָׁמַתִּי, &c.* are of the *preter Tense*, unless there be a *preter Tense* in the *imperative Mood*. It is not the *blundering Transcriber*, but the *School-boy Critick*, that has made the *Confusion* here; who reads the *Text* by *Grammar-rules*, as a *School-boy* does a *Classick Author*.

Ruth. iv. 3, 4, 5.

" He said *Naomi* selleth a Parcel of Land,
" which was our Brother *Elimelech's*; and I
" said, I would speak unto thee, saying, buy
" it before the Elders of my People. If then
" thou wilt redeem it, redeem it; but if he
" will not redeem it, let him tell me, that I
" may know; for there is none but thee to
" redeem it, and I after thee; and he said I
" will redeem it. Then said *Boaz*, when
" thou buyest the Land of *Naomi*, I will buy
" it of *Ruth the Moabitess*.

The Mistakes here are *מִאֵת נִגְאֵל* *Ver. 4*, and *מִאֵת קְנִיתִי* *Ver. 5*, which our Author corrects by altering *תְּנִגְאֵל* into *מִאֵת*; and *קְנִיתִתְךָ* into *קְנִית*, which last Word, that *Ruth* may not be sold into the Bargain, he is pleased to translate by

by *take*, without any Authority but *sic volo*, which indeed is the Critick's Priviledge.

But let us see if the Text cannot be defended as it stands. *Boaz* has assembled the Elders of the City into Court, where he addresses the Kinsman first, then turns himself to the Elders, then changes his Discourse to his Kinsman back again.—*Naomi*, says he, *is going to sell a Parcel of Land, and I said I would inform thee of it, or call upon thee in Court to redeem it.* [then turning himself to the Elders,] *If he will not redeem it, let him tell me;* [then to the Kinsman] *for there is none but thee and I to redeem it.* I see no Impropriety in understanding him to speak first to his Kinsman, and make the Claim upon him, and then to turn to the Judges, let *him* now in Court perform the Law before you, or pass his Title to the Land over to me; then to his Kinsman, for you know I am next to thee in the Entail: The sacred History tells us what *Boaz* said, without advertising the Reader, here *Boaz* speaks to the Elders, and here to his Kinsman, Particulars that there wants no great Sagacity to find out. The Kinsman answers—I will buy it of *Naomi*; *Boaz* replies, *when thou buyest Naomi's Right, I will buy the Right that Ruth the Moabitess has in it, and raise up the Name of the Deceased upon his Inheritance.* The Inheritance, therefore, must go to the Child of *Ruth* at the Jubilee; and the Kinsman finding there might be an Heir to claim the Estate at the Year of Release, refuseth to meddle with the Land, and passes over his Title to *Boaz*. *Boaz* need not have asked the Kinsman's Leave to marry *Ruth*; but he could not redeem the Land without his Kinsman's Leave. There is something very artful in this Conduct of *Boaz*, and a Beauty in the Text which is quite lost in the proposed *Emendations*—*you may buy Naomi's Right, but you shall hold the*

the Land only till the Jubilee, for I will buy Ruth's, and raise up an Heir to it.

Ruth. iv. 20, 21.

“ *Nashon* begat *Shelma* *Salmah*, and *שֶׁלְמָן*

“ *Salmon* begat *Boaz*, &c.”

Mr Kennicott is pleased to espouse a strange Notion of Mr. Jackson's, that several Names have been omitted between *Salmon* and *Boaz* bere in Ruth; and to offer as a strong Proof of it, the different Writing of the Name of the Son of *Nashon*, and Father of *Boaz* in this Place;

“ though *Nashon* begat *Salmah*, it was *Salmon*

“ begat *Boaz*; so that we may fairly suppose

“ the Omission to be in this very Place, and

“ it was perhaps occasioned by the Likeness

“ of these two Names.” p. 544.

Let the Gentleman look at 1 Chron. ii. 11, and Mat. i. 4, and he will find that the Son of *Nashon*, and Father of *Boaz*, was the very same Person, the Identity of the Name in those two parallel Places of Scripture, entirely overturning the hasty Conclusion from the various Writing of it in this. It is to be wished that Mr. Kennicott would spend a little more Time in searching the sacred Scriptures, before he brings forth his strong Proofs against them.

Here our Critick is pleased likewise to declare in Favour of the Greek Chronology, of the first Ages, against the Hebrew Chronology. Here indeed is a Touchstone by which the Hebrew Text may be tried against the Samaritan, Greek, or any other Opponent, in some very interesting and important Particulars, which have occasioned a long and warm Contest among the Learned, where they have fought without gaining or losing an Inch of Ground, till Astronomy was called into the Dispute, and mathematical Demonstration appeared in the Behalf of the Record of Truth, and has put an absolute End

to the Contest. *Kennedy, the British Chronologer,* has taught us to say, that

“ the Sun and Moon in their Courses shine in
 “ Subserviency to the adorable Mysteries of
 “ the Christian Redemption——and the pro-
 “ vidential Purity of the Standard original
 “ Text.”

It is impossible, one would think, but that Mr. *Kennicott* must have heard of such surprising Discoveries; such curious entertaining and important Informations, not critical and conjectural Deductions, but clear, certain, and demonstrative Principles: Astronomical Data, and incontestable Truths. Discoveries that reflect Honour, not only on the Author himself, but on the Nation that gave him Birth. If our Author has heard of them, as Mr. *Jackson*, to whom he gives the Preference, *most certainly* has, what can be the Reason of the Silence he passes them over in, on this Occasion, but an inveterate Enmity to the Text? which they have hedged in from the Incursions of the most violent Opposers. I thank God the *Chronologer* is still living, and proceeding in his incomparable Work; and to him, as its proper Master, I do with great Pleasure and Confidence, leave the Disputes on this Head, and proceed to what lays more level to my Capacity, the plain Words of plain Texts.

2 Sam. ii. 3, p. 450.

“ The *English* Version supposes two Mistakes
 “ in this Verse.”

It does so, and our Author espouses their Supposition for the same Reason, his not understanding it.—*עַחַת מִפְיכָס יִצְאָה* let *Arrogancy* depart from your Mouth, which being a regular Construction of the Words, may shew that the *Negative* **אֲלֹא** is not wanting to make Sense of them. And the *Greek*, *Syriac*, *Chaldee*, and *Arabic* Versions probably misled our Translators. Nor is it necessary that

לֹא “

“ **לֹא** should be **לֹן** as in the Keri.” p. 451.
 “ God is a God of Knowledge, and **עַלְלוֹת** *Ima-*
 “ **לֹא** **נָחָכָנוּ** *shall not be established.*” See
 the Use of **עַלְלוֹת** and **עַלְלִים** *thoughts, Actions, Devices* against God.
 And **נָחָכָן** *numeratus, rectus, dispositus*, Mar. de
 Cal. It is the Mother of the King, the *Messiab* of
 God, who triumphantly exults over her Enemy.—

“ Speak no more Proud, proud Things : Let
 “ Arrogancy depart from your Mouth. God
 “ is a God of Knowledge, and Devices shall
 “ not stand.—The Lord will give Strength
 “ unto his King ; and exalt the Horn of his
 “ Anointed.”

I shall be ranked perhaps among the *Finders out of many Meanings*, for supposing that *Hannah* looked Prophetically forward to the King the *Messiab*, who is to put all Enemies under his Feet ; though I hope for some little Favour for having ascertained *one Sense*.

1 Sam. ii. 16.

“ *Leusden* tells us, **לֹן** *ei potest explicari per*
 “ **לֹא** *nequaquam,*” p. 452.

I will not pretend to say that **לֹן** and **לֹא** can be explanatory of each other ; but either Reading makes good Sense, and a Sense that comes to the very same, and so it is in some other Places. The Words are :

“ Then he would answer, *nay*, but thou shalt
 “ give it me now, or else, &c.

or

“ then he would answer *him* ; but thou shalt
 “ give it me now, or else, &c.”

What is the Difference in the Sense here ?

1 Sam. viii. 19.

The People refused to obey the Voice of Samuel, and they said—[as one would naturally expect it should be

be worded, when they refused—] *nay, but we will have a King*: And as naturally,

1 Sam. x. 19.

where their Demand of a King is Historically related, *ye have this Day rejected your God who himself saved you—and have said unto him, but set a King over us*; and here **אָלָל** or **לֹן** comes to the same.

1 Sam. xii. 12.

This refers to what is said *Cb. viii. 19*, that the People refused to hearken to *Samuel* when he would have dissuaded them from asking a King, *they said unto him, nay, but we will have a King*. *Samuel* repeats this to them here; *ye said to me, nay, but a King shall reign over us*. Is it not properly expressed? *Mr. Kennicott* thinks not, and says,

“ where, as, **לֹן** is not acknowledged by *Greek, Syriac, and Arabic Versions*, we may presume it to be an Alteration of **לֹן**.”

The Versions might have acknowledged **לֹן** here, because it is Truth and very good Sense; whereas **לֹן** scarce makes any Sense; or if it refer to *Jebo-vab*, a Sense not different from what **לֹן** does; because they spake it to *Jebovab* by *Samuel*. *Samuel* speaks all along in his own Person, and not, as in the Name of God, and therefore **לֹן** is the true Reading, there being no *Antecedent* to **לֹן**.

I know not what the marginal Readings called *Keri* were; whether different Readings in different MSS. Corrections of the Text, which they had too much Honesty to insert in the Text itself; Critical Notes, Explanatory, or, &c. and should be glad to be informed. But they have shewn a Fidelity, and Veneration for the Text, and Judgment in my poor Opinion, in placing them in the Margin, and leaving in the Text what they did not understand, and which hath driven them to such ridiculous and contemptible Solutions.

1 Sam. xii. 11.

“ And the Lord sent *Jerubbaal*, and בֶּן בְּדָן, and *Jeptab*, and *Samuel*.”

Mr. Kennicott contends for a Corruption here in *Bedan* for *Barak*, because the LXX read it so; and he says,

“ If any Evidence could be wanting, St. *Paul* puts this Corruption out of all Doubt, for alluding plainly to this Passage, he says, (Heb. xi. 32.)—*the Time would fail me to tell of Gideon* [i. e. *Jerubbael*] *of Barak*, of *Sampson*, of *Jeptab*, and of *Samuel*.” p. 90.

The LXX is no Evidence at all for any particular Reading, nor St. *Paul* any Evidence in this Case; it does not appear that he alludes to this Passage, but to the History in general, where these great Men are celebrated for their heroic Faith; and if he doth *allude* to it, he doth not cite it—as it stands, even with the Alteration proposed: So that a Doubt still remains about this Corruption, and some other Evidence is still wanting to ascertain it. As to *Bedan* he was a near Relation of *Jeptab*; and 1 Cbr. vii. 17, is reckoned among the Sons or Grandsons of *Gilead*, the Father of *Jeptab*; and was by Birth the Prince of *Gilead*, being the eldest Son of *Gilead*, the Son of *Macbir*, who was Father of (the Country of) *Gilead*; and so in all Probability was concerned in the Wars against *Ammon*, before their Application to *Jeptab*, or during his Regency, or perhaps before, during the Judgeship of *Jair* his Cousin, though he is not particularly mentioned in the History. But *Gilead* being the Seat of this War, in which *Jeptab* so bravely signalized himself, and *Bedan* being so great a Man in this Country, at least a great Man there, it is a strong Presumption that God had given some Success to his Arms, and some Deliverance to *Israel* by him; they had waged a long and dubious War with *Am-*

mon before Jeptab was called in, and somebody must head them, and who more likely than their natural born Head? We may reasonably conclude therefore that *Bedan* had done something for which he deserved to be remembered, though he has no especial Place in the History, and that the Text is not corrupted.

I Sam. xii. 5, 10, and 13, 19, p. 452.

“ The same Verb is here printed *Singular*, instead of *Plural* ; ”

and might *non obstante Bytbner*, be originally written so; as we have seen before.

I Sam. xiv. 14, p. 452.

“ And the first Slaughter which *Jonathan*, and

“ his Armour-bearer made, was about twenty

5 “ Men, within, as it were, an half Acre of

“ Land, which a Yoke of Oxen might plow.”

We have here the whole Artillery of Criticism drawn forth against the Text; Guesses, Corrections, Emendations, the Versions and *Arabic*; all join in torturing three or four plain Words, and make—nothing of them at last—about twenty Men

כְּבָחֶצְיָה מִעֵנָה צָמֵד שָׁדָה. The whole of the Elaborate Explication is owing to the Hint יְמִין gave the *Greek* Translators; for חֶצְיָה signifying an Arrow, as well as half, and they not knowing what to make of צָמֵד, thought it natural for *Jonathan*, and his Armour-bearer, after they had spent all their Arrows, to catch up the Stones, and knock down the Enemy with them: And that inexhaustible Fund of Confusion, the *Arabic* having a Word as much like צָמֵד as a Windmill is to a Giant, viz. נְגָכָר, which in *Arabic* signifies a Pebble, it is now beyond a Probability that that was the very Word; and it is certain the *LXX* read the Hebrew in a different manner than it stands at present; which has happily prepared the way to the Correction of this Passage; for you must know the *LXX* could not mistake,

mistake, and so mistranslate a Text; but you may venture to translate the *Greek* back again into the *Hebrew*, and you will have the very original Text as it stands now, or *ought to stand*; and this Method with the Help of *Arabic*, and a few other arbitrary Alterations, will most certainly recover the true genuine Word of God, which all good Men so much desire to see, but to their great Mortification cannot find at present.

However as the Words under Consideration seem to be *Hebrew*, before we turn them into *Greek* or *Arabic*, let us see what Sense they will make when construed as *Hebrew*.

תְּמַנֵּן, which has been the Stone of Stumbling, not *filex minoris geris*, signifies to *join together*, *associate*, *pair*; see *Mar. de Cal.* and is applied to any thing in Pairs, a Pair of Asses, Horses, Oxen; Horsemen riding two and two; any thing that stood Side by Side; some Ornaments for the Hands, from their being in Pairs, or from their make; and, *Isai. v. 10*, is applied to some things that were in Pairs, Ranks, Rowes, or Ridges in a Vineyard, *ten צָמְרָה of a Vineyard shall yield one Batb*: Their Vines were planted in *Ranks*, with a proper Space between, or at a proper Distance; and very likely stood upon Ridges, which running along one by another, at such a Distance, and being usually of such a Length as Convenience required, תְּמַנֵּן, a Pair, or Ranks, of a Vineyard, or of the Field, was a Piece of Ground of such a Length and Breadth; of some determinate Quantity, it is plain, because *Isaiah* says ten of them should yield but one *Batb*.

מענה is the dreſt Ground between these Pairs or Ranks; whether the Ridges, which plowed ground is cast up in, or Rowes of Vines or other Trees the Vineyard was planted in. And מענה צָמְרָה is the Ground of one *Pair*, or between two Ranks.

from ענה מעה is a very good Word for cultivated Ground, either as *subdued* by Culture, or as the plain flat Ground between two Ridges.

is within about half way, so, *Jonathan* and his Armour bearer slew twenty Men within half the Breadth, [or Length] of the plain Ground between two Ranks of Vines, Olives, or Fig-trees in the Field, or between the Ridges of plowed Ground. This struck a Pannick into all the rest, and that seconded by a miraculous Earthquake, the whole Army fled; the two Heroes driving Thousands upon Thousands before them. It is not the Weapons they made use of, but the short Compass of Ground within which they slew so many Men, the Text speaks of *in the Hebrew*. The Ranks or Rowes they planted their Vines, Olives, and Fig-trees in, were no doubt usually about the same Distance; and so the plain Ground between the Ranks in the Field, was a Piece of Ground of a determinate Breadth. It is natural to suppose that Men marched along the Ground between a Couple of Ranks, or Ridges, and here *Jonathan* attacked them; and, within half the Space between, slew twenty of them: And now if צמד be a Rank, or any thing in Pairs, and מעה be the Ground between two Ranks, Rowes, or Ridges, we shall have no Occasion for the *Arabic Confusion*, or *Greek Blunder*, to construe the Text. Our Translators seem to have thought there could be nothing in Pairs, or Ranks in the Field, but Oxen; and so have twisted the Sense to that Mistake.

This Gentleman is very angry with your *rabbinical Illustrations* of the Text, but doth not consider that *Arabic*, is only the old Devil in another Dress, improved in Wickedness, but not in Understanding.

1 Sam. xvi. 23. “ The Word for *et fuit* must
“ be *וַיְהִי*.” p. 454.

But why must it?

1 Sam. xvii. 7. “ *חֶלֶב* sagitta is properly *עֵץ* lig-
“ num in MS. 2.”

חֶלֶב signifies the Arrow-part or shaft of his Spear, which is like an Arrow, and so is as proper a Word as *עֵץ* the Wood of his Spear, and might be the original Word in this as *עֵץ* is in other Places.

1 Sam. xx. 1. “ This same MS. properly reads
“ *מִנְיָת* instead of *נוֹיָת*.”

I suppose *properly*, because *נוֹיָת* occurs five or six times, and *נוֹיָת* never; and it would not have been proper, had it done so, because the נ in *נוֹיָת* is *radical*.

—“ And in Ver. 2. *לֹא יַעֲשֵׂה* non faciet, have
“ been corrupted into *לֹן* *עַשֵּׂה* ei fecit; all
“ the antient Versions read properly.” *ibid.*

Perhaps not *corrupted*, it is more proper as it stands; not as it is construed indeed. *David* says to *Jonatban*, what is my Sin that thy Father seeketh my Life; and he said, Prithee, God forbid, thou shalt not die; behold, prithee, does my Father do any Thing great or small, and not tell me of it? And wby should my Father bide this Thing from me? it is not so. That *לֹן* is an *expletive*, and signifies *Quæso*, prithee, pray now; see *Leigh* and *Buxtorf*. And as *David* was speaking of what was past or present—thy Father seeketh my Life, and *Jonatban* endeavours to quiet his Fears, and convince him there was nothing in his Suspicion, because he knew nothing of it; it is more proper as it is in the Text—“ does my Father, I pray you, do any thing, and not inform me of it?”—than if he had said, my Father will not do any thing; the first implying that his Father had formed no such Design, because he knew nothing of it; the latter, that if there was such a Design he should know of it by and by. I do not say the

other Reading would not be Sense; but the present seems the most easy and natural Way of Speaking, and most suitable to the Occasion; however it is *good Sense*, which the *Correſtor* might have seen had he been pleased to have considered, which he never does, what Sense the Words would make as they stand. *All the antient Versions read properly*, he says, as if the textual Reading were not proper. It is the most preposterous Way he is fallen into of turning the *Versions* back again literally into *Hebrew*, and then concluding that to have been the *Reading* in the Copies they translated from, without making any Allowance for *Ignorance* or *Design*, or the *Liberty* which all *Translators* take, in not confining themselves to the *Letter*, or slavishly rendering it *Word for Word*.

1 Sam. xx. 38. “The Word ‘עַצֵּן should be
“ בְּעַצֵּן not being in Construct.” *Ibid.*

No Reason can be given why ‘עַצֵּן should not be a *Noun* with a *Formative* ‘, as well as so many others. ‘עַצֵּן from the same *Verb*, is generally the *Noun* for *dimidium*, and occurs in other Places, besides this Chapter, for *an Arrow*, as it is terminated here. Nor will Ver. 20 and 21, justify the Alteration proposed, for *Jonatban* might say, I will shoot two or three Arrows, and yet shoot but one. Ver. 36. “Run, find now the Arrows which “ *I shoot* :” The Lad was running, and he shot an Arrow beyond him; and according to the Sign agreed upon, crys out,—*Is not the Arrow beyond thee?* Does the Story now require more Arrows than one; or can we conclude, that because *Jonatban* orders a Servant to pick up the Arrows he should shoot, that therefore the Text is corrupted which says, *be shot an Arrow beyond him*, and not *Arrows*? Had the first Arrow fallen short of the Lad, no doubt he would have shot another; because it was necessary to answer the Signal agreed upon

upon betwixt him and *David*; and he might shoot short of the Lad first by Accident; which the History, I suppose, did not require the particular mention of, being only concerned with the Arrow that went beyond for the Signal. In short, this, and Numbers of others, are such frivolous idle Quarrels with the Text, that I am almost ashamed to spend my own and the Reader's Time upon them.

—כָּלִי 2 Sam. i. 21. “**בְּלִי**” was probably at first

“as the Particle **בְּלִי** seems not to signify
“quasi non.” p. 122.

There might be some Pretence to say that **כ** had vanished some how or other from before **בְּלִי**; but there is a particular Beauty in this Circumstance, that highly aggravates the Distress; that *Soul* anointed with Oil, yet fell as a common Man; and the Slaughter no doubt must be great, and the Defeat general, when the King himself was involved in it: The People would hardly desert their Prince, and we may justly expect heaps of Slaughter before they would suffer the Uncircumcised to mingle the Blood of the Anointed of the Lord with that of the common Soldier. The Change of **בְּלִי** into **כָּלִי** makes a flat insipid tautology.—*The Sheild of Saul, the Arms of one anointed with Oil*; instead of —*The Sheild of Saul, of one not anointed with Oil*, as if a common Man. The Comparison is much stronger without the **כ**. *Saul* not only lost his Honour there, and was trampled under foot with the meanest Slave, but became an abominable Branch, a *broken Idol*; the sacred Oil was become common, and the divine Character erased. It was no more **שָׁאוֹל**, one eagerly desired, or the Anointed of *Je-borab*, but a Carcass polluted with Blood; and therefore *David* forbids the Dew of Heaven ever to make glad the Mountains where this Disgrace fell upon *Israel*; and calls *Saul*, not what he was

before the Battle, but what he was afterwards. David doth not say *bistorically* that Saul was not anointed, but *poetically*; as not allowing as it were, that the *holy Oil* could be so polluted, and speaks of him as one who had not had it poured on him, since he died like such a one. He had been, but was not now, *the anointed*; and God had cast him off as if he had never been otherwise.

“ Ye Mountains of *Gilboa*, let there be no
 “ Dew, nor Rain upon you: or the Fields of
 “ the High-Places, for there the Shield of
 “ the mighty נָעַל became abominable [stain-
 “ ed, vile] the Shield of Saul, of one not
 “ anointed with Oil.” *

“ But, בְּלֹ seems not to signify *quasi non*?
 true; but it signifies, *non*.

“ and is omitted in the *Syriac* and *Arabic*
 “ Versions.”

Is it the only Omission or Variation from the Text, for which there is no apparent Reason? The LXX translate it, *the Shield of Saul was not anointed with Oil*; which is at least as good an Authority for the present *Reading*, as the *Syriac* and *Arabic* against it; and, if any Version were a proper Evidence in such Particulars, certainly would deserve the Preference on many Accounts.

2 Sam. i. 22. “ The Verb נִשְׁוָן has been mis-
 “ transcribed for נִשְׁבָּן, *ibid.* and p. 454. it is
 “ נִשְׁוָן in MS. 2, &c.”

But

* It is proper to mention here, that the ingenious Mr. *Comings* refers *not anointed* to the *Shield of Saul*, and he has the Authority of the LXX for that Construction; and the Custom of anointing with Oil their Arms, as *Isai.* xxi. 5. Whether this was as a sacred Rite, or for its common Use, or both, I shall not dispute; but *Saul* doth not seem so far abandoned, as to neglect, in Contempt, the divine Help, which he had taken so much Pains to procure, as 1 Sam. xxviii. 6. consulting God by *Dreams*, by *Urim*, and by *Prophets*, amounts to. See *Comings*, p. 39.

But no Reason is given in either Place for this Alteration, only that some MSS. read it so: But what is the Difference of the two Words; and why is not the old Word as proper as the new one? **נִכְנָה** is to *retreat, retire, draw back*; and is applied to Men being beat back, or defeated in Battle; and the Confusion or Shame that attends it. It is used to turning back a Bound-stone, or Land-mark, and properly enough as it is turning back any Thing that was coming forward. **נִשְׁגַּן** is to *take bold of, come up with, reach to*. *Mar. de Cal.* apprehendit, comprehendit.

“ Without the Blood of the Slain, the Bow
“ of Jonathan was not taken **אַחֲרָה** back,” [or
carried off the Field] “ and the Sword of Saul
“ returned not empty.”

Whether it mean here that the Armour-bearer did not take it back till it had done Execution; or it refer to the last Battle in which Jonathan was killed, and his Bow taken by the Enemy—that though he fell, he sold his Life dear—without the Blood of the Slain the Bow of Jonathan was not over-reached, taken behind, may be considered.

2 Sam. v. 1—10, p. 19 to 62.

This Passage, and its parellel Place in *Chronicles*, differ in the Wording in several Instances; which I apprehend is no Proof that either of them are corrupted, if they agree in Sense. One may relate such Particulars as are passed over in the other, or be more full in Circumstance; such Differences are no Objections to the Integrity of the Text, unless it could be proved that one Passage was designed as a *Transcript* of the other; the later Writer borrowing from the other, and not designing to tell the same Story in his own Way and Method: The same Order of Words, Identity of Phrase, and the same numerical Circumstances, in the same Order of Narration, are not necessary in the Relation

tion of the same Piece of History. The four Gospels are the History of *Christ*; but none of the Particulars above are observed in the different Relations; and many useful Purposes are served by this *Diversity of Manner*, when there is no Inconsistency in Substance. It is taken for granted here that the *Chronicles* were writ since the Captivity, which there is no positive Proof of at all; and for which no Reason has been assigned, but that some Parts of them were writ afterwards, as if the authorised Scribes in the Time of the Prophets had not a Right to add occasionally, or insert, as in the Genealogies. I will put down these two parellel Pieces of History in the same Page, and mark the differential Words and Circumstances.

2 Sam. v. 1—10.

And all the Tribes of *Israel* came to **דָוִיד** *David* to *Hebron*; and spake saying; *behold we thy Bone and thy Flesh we are.*

Also in time past, when *Saul* was King over us, thou **הַיִתָּה** *wast* **מִצְרַיִם** *he that leddest out*, and **הַמְבִיא** *broughtest in* *Israel*. And the *Lord* said unto thee, thou shalt feed my People *Israel*, and thou shalt be **לִגְנִיד** *Captain over* *my People Israel*: So all the Elders of *Israel* came to the King to *Hebron*.

And King *David* made a Covenant with them in *Hebron*

1 Chron. xi. 1.

And all *Israel* were gathered together to **דָוִיד** *David* to *Hebron*; saying, *behold, thy Bone and thy Flesh we are.*

Also in time past, even when *Saul* was King, thou *wast* he that leddest out, and **הַמְבִיא** *broughtest in* *Israel*. And the *Lord* thy God said unto thee, thou shalt feed my People *Israel*, and thou be **נָגִיד** *Captain over* *my People Israel*; So all the Elders of *Israel* came to the King to *Hebron*.

And *David* made a Covenant with them in *Hebron*

Hebron before the Lord ; | Hebron before the Lord ;
and they anointed Da- | and they anointed David
vid King over Israel. | King over Israel.

The Difficulties hitherto are not great, **דוד** and **דוויל** **שלשים** **שלשומ** **הטול** ; so **ארטמול** and **ארטומ** are not peculiar to these Passages, but writ either way in other Places. **ח'יתח** is also not without a Number of Examples to justify it, as **צ'יתח** and others, where the **ח** is as much unnecessary as it is here : Nor is **מוצ'יא** defective without the **ה** before it ; though **המ'ב**, if it comes from **בוא**, is without the **א** after it ; and what else it should come from I know not ; and the Marginal here seems to me to be the truest Reading ; but see *Comings*, p. 24. **ננ'יד** and **לננ'יד** **ננ'יד** are the same thing : And **ננ'יד** seems to have been the original Reading in *Samuel*, since the *Vulgate* gives it us without the Preposition in both Places ; at least this is as good an Argument as the Version of the *LXX* is for the contrary. See *Kennicott*, p. 24.

To feed is a beautiful Metaphor borrowed from the Shepherd, and applied to God and Man, as having the Care of others upon them. *Jacob* says, Gen. xlvi. 15. *The God* **חרעה** *which fed me all my Life long* : And he characterises the King of *Israel* under the Metaphor of a Shepherd, Gen. xlii. 24. so the Metaphor is older than the Appointment of *David* to the Throne ; and *Bishop Patrick* and others are mistaken in their Observation, cited p. 24.

The Book of *Chronicles*, to the anointing of *David* King over *Israel*, adds,

“ according to the Word of the Lord by the
“ Hand of *Samuel* ; ”

which Words are wanting in the other Account, and here our Author gives us another Instance of his peculiar Talent in commenting on Scripture, p. 26.

“ The

“ The last Phrase—has been thought harsh in
the Original.”

I hope not more harsh than in other Places ; 1 Sam. xxviii. 15. *answereth me not by the Hand of Prophets.* Ver. 17. *as he spake by my Hand.* And Ezra. iii. 18.

“ and is very absurdly paraphrased in the
“ Vulgate.”

not paraphrased, but literally translated ; nor absurdly ; tho’ *Hand* in *English*, and *Manas* in *Latin*, sound not what ^{רָאשׁ} does in *Hebrew*. But if translated at all, what other Word could the LXX and Vulgate have used, unless they would have justified an Alteration of the Text by omitting *Hand* here ? *Hand* in *Hebrew* signifies the Means, Instrument, Agency, or Power by which any thing acts ; and is derived from a *Verb* that will justify this Definition, as Usage will the Phrase above. And however absurd the Translation may be, the Comment that follows is far more so.

“ The Phrase seems peculiarly proper, when
“ we consider that the Word of the Lord was
“ entirely fulfilled by Samuel’s anointing David
“ King.”

by *bis Hand*, I presume, the Gentleman means : as if that would account for the *Harshness* of speaking *by the Hand*. But the Word of the Lord was so far from being *entirely fulfilled* by Samuel’s anointing *David with his Hand*, that it was not fulfilled at all till many Years afterwards : *David* being *King*, neither *de jure*, nor *de facto*, till the Death of *Saul* ; and not over *all Israel*, till now that all the Elders of *Israel* anointed him *King* over all *Israel*. This Insertion of *fulfilled*, to account for the Word being spoke by the *Hand* of *Samuel*, [which to be sure was originally in the Text, tho’ it has eloped out of all the *Masoretic Copies*, which have been absurdly followed by all the antient Versions]

sions] redounds but little to the Credit of the Author's critical Acumen in *Hebrew*; and leaves a Number of other Places open to Censure, unless the Commandments of God by the Hand of their Prophets were *entirely fulfilled by their Hand*, as soon as spoke. The Gentleman does not consider the *Hebrew* as an ideal Language, nor had a Glimpse of the Meaning of the Phrase here. If he had, he would not have ventured so absurd a Comment to account for the Harshness of it.

But to go on with the Texts.

2 Sam. v. 6.

And the King and his Men went to *Jerusalem* against the *Jebusites* the Inhabitants of the Land: And they spake unto *David*, saying, thou shalt not come in hither, unless thou remove the Blind and the Lame; saying, *David* shall not come in hither. Nevertheless *David* took the strong Hold: the same is the City of *David*.

1 Chron. xi. 4.

And *David* and all *Israel* went to *Jerusalem*, which is *Jebus*; and \square attacked the *Jebusites*, the Inhabitants of the Land: And the Inhabitants of *Jebus* said to *David*, thou shalt not come in hither. Nevertheless *David* took the Castle of *Sion*, which is the City of *David*.

Jerusalem and the City of *David* are to be distinguished as two, tho' like *London* and *Westminster* they were united. *David* attacks *Jebus* or *Jerusalem*, and takes the strong hold or Fortress of *Sion*; which facilitated the Conquest of the City, tho' it was so strong that the Inhabitants bid him defiance in the most contemptible Terms, telling him they would not surrender unless he removed all the Blind and the Lame out of his Army; which seems a Sarcasm on *David* and his Heroes,

who

who having been long engaged in Wars, were possibly many of them wounded, and damaged in their Limbs ; and not unlikely that some of them might have lost an Eye, with Wounds in their Face. This seems to be the Jest. Whether *David* himself had got any Hurt in his Wars or no, is not mentioned, but it looks likely ; because it is added, saying, or meaning, by their Jest, *David shall not come in bitter*. Either that he would have but few left, when the Maimed were removed, or that he himself, as one of them, must be excluded if they should surrender on these Terms.

Ver. 8.

And *David* command-
ed on that Day כָּל מִכָּה יְבוּסִי, a general Assault
on *Ibusi* (or *Jerusalem*)
and יְצַבֵּא they got in by
the Gutter. And the
Lame and the Blind
שְׁנָאו נֶפֶשׁ רֹא opposed
the Attempt of *David* :
because they had said,
the Blind and the Lame
shall not come into בֵּית.

Ver. 6.

And *David* said, who-
soever smiteth the Jebu-
sites first, shall be Chief
and Captain : And Joab
the Son of Zeruiab went
up first, and was Chief.

David was Master now of the upper City, or
City of *Sion*, called afterwards the City of *David*.
And the other City [called יְבוּסִי, *Josh.* xviii. 28.
as it is here] refusing to surrender, undoubtedly
upon the Terms order'd to be offered in the Law,
and accompanying their Refusal with Words of
Contempt, *David* orders a general Assault. Whe-
ther we translate כָּל מִכָּה, let every one be smiting,
i. e. smite ; or, as a Noun Substantive, it comes to
the same. That they did so as commanded, is not
expressed, but, as on other Occasions, to be taken
for

for granted. And their Success is told us in short ; and **וְיַגַּד** the Entry was made (as **הַנִּיד**, **אָמַר**, &c. are construed) by **צָנּוֹר** [in all probability, as the Gentleman has construed it] the subterraneous Passage. The Inhabitants, in pursuance of their Ridicule on *David* and his batter'd Veterans, manned their Walls with only Invalids, lame and infirm Men, **בַּל כֵּן**, because they had said the *Lame* and the *Blind* shall not come in : And if they had not found this under-ground Passage, the Walls were of such Strength and Height, as it seems, that the *Invalids* were sufficient to have defended them.

That **שָׁנָא** is an Enemy, and to oppose as an Enemy, see *Exod.* i. 10. *Lest when there falleth out any War, they join שָׁנָאֵינוּ our Enemies.* *Judg.* xi. 7. *Did ye not שָׁנָא חָטָא hate me and expel me.*

It may admit of a Dispute, whether **נַפְשׁ** be to be referred to *David*, or the *Blind* and *Lame*, because the Affections are all attributed to the **נַפְשׁ**, or animal Frame : But it seems to refer to *David*, and his Desire to conquer the *Jebusites*. *1 Sam.* xx. 4. *What does thy נַפְשׁ say ? i. e. What is thy Desire ? Ezek. xvi. 27. I gave thee נַפְשׁ up to the Desire of them that bated thee.* So here the *Lame* and the *Blind* opposed *David's Desire*, or eager Attempt on the City. The Words that follow, because they had said, the *Lame* and the *Blind* shall not come in, are very consistent with manning their Walls with Invalids only, it being opposing Invalids, according to their Jest, to Invalids.

This is the most difficult Part of this intricate (as it is called) Passage of Scripture ; and the most literal Translation seems to be the best Comment upon it : Nor is there any Violence in the Construction of **שָׁנָא נַפְשׁ** by opposed the Attempt. However it is submitted with all due Deference.

This Account in *Samuel* of the taking of *Jerusalem* differs from the other in *Chronicles*, saying nothing

thing of *Joab*, and the Share he had in it, as that says nothing how they took it, or of this Ridicule upon them ; and the Text in *Samuel* is condemned as

“ very incompleat in this Place—and therefore the Words which regularly fill up this Omission are to be restored from *Chronicles*.” p. 46.

But where was the Necessity for every Circumstance to be mentioned in each Place ? The Text in *Samuel* is perfect as far as it goes, and that in *Chronicles* is no more ; if you borrow from *Chronicles* to supply what is not mentioned about *Joab* in *Samuel*, why do not you borrow from *Samuel* to supply what is not mentioned about the Lame and the Blind in *Chronicles* ? And where would this end, but in making one History of two ? The Text in *Samuel* that only says *David* ordered a general Assault, says nothing to be sure of any Reward proposed to him who should first enter the Town ; nor of the Person who did so ; but is not at all inconsistent with the other Account which mentions the Encouragement, and the Person who got the Glory. It appears from both Accounts, that a general Assault was ordered ; one is more full in some Particulars, and the other in others ; but neither of them want botching.

Verse 9.

So *David* dwelt in the Fort, and called it the City of *David*. And *David* built round about from *Millo*, and to *Bith*.

Verse 7, 8.

And *David* dwelt in the Fort ; therefore they called it the City of *David*. And he built the City round about from *Millo*, and round about, or in a Circle.

It

It appears that **מַלְוָא** was the Name of the Citadel of the City of *David*; and he built the City in a Circle round the Citadel, *from Millo*, as the Center of the Circle, *round about*, and *round about* says one Text; and *from Millo round about to Bitb*, says the other. Was *Bitb* the same as *Millo*? Some think so; but compare 2 *Sam. Ver. 7, 8.* and *Bitb* seems to have been Part of *Jerusalem* or *Jebusi*—*David took the Stronghold of Sion*, which was *Millo*, and yet was not in Possession of *Bitb*, *Ver. 8. the Blind and the Lame shall not come into Bitb*. There was a House or Palace for *David* somewhere in the City no doubt, and it was in the Fort or Citadel; and that may be the House of *Millo* mentioned 2 *Kings xii. 20*; but if *David* was in Possession of *Millo*, before he ordered the Assault upon *Jebusi*, as is plain from the History, then the *Bitb* he was refused Admittance into, must be some eminent Building belonging to *Jerusalem*; and his Building from *Millo to Bitb* implies that the Space betwixt the Citadel, and that *Bitb*, was the Radius of the Circle the City of *David* was built in.

The Text in *Chronicles* adds,

“ *and Joab יְהִי ה' the rest of the City;*” which has been variously interpreted, and now is condemned as *corrupt*, and expelled the Text, and instead of it a Patent is introduced appointing *Joab* Governour of the City. I will suppose the Verb here to mean what it does every where else, *to live*; and the Sense will be, that after he had smote the *Jebusites*, *he saved the rest of the City*; and the Difficulty started against this Construction, p. 53, will receive an easy Solution from *Josh. xv. 63. As for the Jebusites, the Inhabitants of Jerusalem, the Children of Judah could not drive them out; but the Jebusites dwell with the Children of Judah at Jerusalem unto this Day.* There was a Part of the City belonging to *Judah*, but the *Jebusites* being Masters

ters of the City refused to admit *David*, and forced the Children of *Judah* to stand the Siege with them ; and therefore *Joab* when he destroyed the *Jebusites*, saved the rest of the City ; and deserved some eminent Reward for his Bravery and Justice ; and I hope had it, whether in being constituted General, or Governor of the City, or both, which this Text says nothing about ; only telling us that he made a proper Distinction betwixt the *Jebusites*, and his Brethren of *Judah*. And the Emendation of the Words, however *ingenious*, will be unnecessary ; but the Attempt to mend them, is justly chargeable with the Want of a proper Veneration for the Word of God, as well as of Skill in construing it. And it is to be hoped that this, and the many other Alterations proposed as *necessary*, merely from not understanding the Text, will blunt the Edge of that forward Disposition, in our Author, to cut, instead of trying to untie the Knots, which bad Translations, and worse Comments have made in Scripture. He is in too much Hurry, and should not be trusted with a Sword, till he can use it with more Temper. Such a Licence in criticising will make quidlibet ex quolibet, and turn the Bible into the *Tale of a Tub*, a Book proper to be perused by every *Quixote* in Criticism.

<i>2 Sam. v. Ver. 10.</i>	<i>1 Ch. xi. 9.</i>
And <i>David</i> waxed greater and greater, for the <i>Lord God of Hosts</i> was with him.	And <i>David</i> waxed greater and greater, for the <i>Lord of Hosts</i> was with him.

Our Author's Fingers have contracted a strange Itching to be at the Text, and a very small Excuse is sufficient for falling upon it ; here *Lord God of Hosts* must be altered to *Lord of Hosts*, because *Lord of Hosts*, which

“ appears

“ appears first, 1 Sam. i. 11.”
 though it appear as yet at Ver. 3, of that Chapter,
 —“ occurs above 200 Times, and the other
 “ Phrase not perhaps above 20 ; if the Phrase
 “ in these two Verses—were originally the
 “ same—”

which you are to take for granted, as it makes Work for the Tinker.

—“ It seems right to prefer the Phrase in *Chronicles* ;”

and correct without doubt all the other Places where the Phrase in *Samuel* occurs, for if one of them were *originally* as it stands here, that might be the original Reading here.

But p. 525, the Gentleman has changed his Mind, and says :

“ I formerly thought the latter (Lord of Hosts) to be the juster Phrase, because it occurs ten times oftener ; but I now suspect that אלה' אל always preceded צבאות originally—”

which makes the most Work for the Tinker ; and we have now 200 Places or more to correct instead of 20. His Reason for this is, that *Jehovah* cannot be properly placed in *Construct* ; nor is it in *Construct* ; *Hosts* is a reclaimed Name, and applied to God, or used as his Name, as *Heaven* is ; and so it is *Jehovah the Hosts*, not of Hosts ; see this Word explained at large in Mr. *Hutchinson's—Sine Principio*, et al. in his Writings.

We frequently find the *Mem Final* retained in Words in *Regimine*, which by Rule might have been dropt ; and the Author would have several such Words, which he refers to, corrected. But there are too many Instances to suppose them Errors of the Transcribers ; and his Solution of the Difficulty, p. 526. that sometimes they did not see the **ו**, or its substituted *Dash*, when it was there,

and at other times imagined it to be there when it was not so, is too whimsical and arbitrary to pass current, unless *I think*, and *I suspect* are not to be disputed.

2 Sam. vi. 6.

And when they came to Nachon's Threshing-floor, Uzzab **אֶשְׁלָח** **אֶל** the Ark, and **אָחֹז** **בּוֹ** for **שָׁמְטוֹ** **הַבָּקָר**. And the Anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzzab, and he smote him there **עַל הַשְׁלָל**.

1 Chron. xiii. 9, 10.

And when they came to Chidon's Threshing-floor, Uzzah *put forth* *his Hand* **לְאָחֹז** the Ark, for **שָׁמְטוֹ** **הַבָּקָר**. And the Anger of the Lord was kindled against Uzzab, and he smote him because *he put forth his Hand* **עַל** upon the Ark.

The first Amendment here is the restoring **אֶת יָדוֹ** in *Samuel*, which is so necessary to the Sense, and to fill up a *Chasm*, that we cannot do without it, p. 456. The Meaning no doubt is that he exerted, or *sent forth* something; but if **שָׁלַח** may be construed here, as it seems to be, *Gen. xxxviii. 25*, that he *challenged*, *laid claim* to the Ark, the Word *Hand* will not be wanting. *Judah* says—*bring forth Tamer*, and when she was brought forth, **אֶשְׁלָחָה** **אֶל** *she challenges ber Father in Law*, and *Judah* acknowledges it. That *Uzzab's* Crime was *challenging* the Ark to himself, or laying claim to it, is shewn by Mr. *Hutchinson*—*when they came to Nachon's Threshing-floor, Uzzab laid claim to the Ark, and seized upon it, for they were dismissing the Oxen*, returning his Cattle to him, and taking the Ark to themselves, as the Priests had a Right to do; the Priests being to cover the holy Vessels, and the *Levitites* of the Sons of *Kobath* to carry them. **אָחֹז** is *to seize*, the Noun an *Inheritance*, what a Man holds as his own. This being *Uzzab's* Crime—

God

God smote him there על הַשְׁלָל for the Violence, which Words are to be corrected into יְרוּאֵל אֲשֶׁר שְׁלָחָה יְהוָה ; and all this upon the Credit of the same Letters with הַשְׁלָל in הַשְׁלָל, being the same Letters with שְׁלָחָה ; and הַשְׁלָל at the end of a Word like הַשְׁלָל at the beginning of it ; and הַשְׁלָל not being found as a Noun any where else. But הַשְׁלָל comes as regularly from נָשַׁל, as נָשַׁל from נָשַׁל, and signifies to *snatch, catch, at a Thing.* And so both Texts say the same thing, though in somewhat different Words ; both agree in saying *be seized the Ark* ; one that he *snatched bold of it*, the other that *be laid his Hand upon it.* I suspect that הַשְׁלָל, شְׁלָל and נָשַׁל, are the same Root, and that the Word signifies to *catch, rob, spoil, strip* : And though *Spoil* as a Noun is always writ שְׁלָל, with a double ל ; yet the Verb has but one ל. And so הַשְׁלָל helps to explain what *Uzzab* put forth his Hand for ; and the injudicious Correction proposed here would contribute very much to the keeping this important Passage of Scripture in that Darkness, the Inattention of Commentators, and the Ridicule of Enemies have hitherto involved it in ; so dangerous is the *Licentia Critica.*

2 Sam. vii. 23, 24.

Who is like thy People, even like *Israel*, the only Nation on Earth, whom God went to redeem for a People to himself, and to make him a Name ; and to do, for *yourselves* great Things and terrible, for thy Land, before thy People, which thou redeemedst

1 Ch. xvii. 21, 22.

What one Nation in the Earth is like thy People *Israel*, whom God went to redeem to be his own People, to make thee a Name of Greatness and Terribleness, by driving out Nations from before thy People who thou redeemedst from *Egypt* ; and madest thy People

deemedst to thee from | People *Israel* thine own
 Egypt, the Nations and | for ever.
 their Gods.

We have here two Copies of *David's* Prayer ;
 or the Substance of his Prayer recorded by different
 Authors, in different Words ; the Purport is the
 same in both Places. But,

“ the comparison of them will discover some
 “ *Corruptions*—not *Variations* only ; but *Cor-
 ruptions* properly so called—Mistakes in
 “ both Copies—*Strange Variations.*” p. 457
 —460.

And we are sure that these Variations are Corrup-
 tions, and that we have lost the true Text, because,

“ this Prayer of *David* was spoke in *one only*
 “ *certain* Manner—one and the same Appeal
 “ to God, must have been one and the same
 “ originally.”

But as it is not proved, only taken for granted,
 that it was spoke *only in one* certain Manner, or that
David might not repeat the several Particulars *over
 and over again*, as he does in the *Psalms*, the 119th
 in particular, and dwell in the Warmth of his Gra-
 titude upon the great Things he praised God for,
 the Conclusion that the *Variations* are *Corruptions*,
 remains to be proved. But granting that *David*
 did not speak as People in the Fulness of their
 Heart and Overflowings of Devotion, when speak-
 ing *extempore* naturally do, yet we may be easy for
 the Integrity of the Text, because there is no Rea-
 son to think, as there was no manner of Necessity
 for it, that either one sacred Writer or the other
 did design to give us the Prayer in the same nu-
 meral Words placed in the same Order. Both
Samuel and *Chronicles* introduce *David* as speaking
 to God ; but why must they repeat every Word he
 said ? Is there a single Passage in Scripture, where

the same Speech, Prayer, Transaction, or, &c. is repeated, that is related in the same Manner, to the most minute Word and Circumstance?

The first *Variation* corrected is—the Aleim *they want*, or *whom the Aleim want themselves*, which is conformed to הָלַךְ in the other Text, for fear, I suppose, it should be thought that אלהי is a *plural Noun*.

The next is of אלהי לְכָם into אלהי ; but why a *plural Pronoun* may not be used in speaking to God, as well as by God himself, when speaking in his own *Persons*, [as, *Let us make Man in our Image, &c.*] I will leave to the Author's further Consideration.

It is not worth while to examine the *Corruptions* supposed in the Names and Titles of God, since those Names are all to be found in other Parts of Scripture: Only it may not be amiss to take notice of what the Gentleman is pleased to say about *Adonai*, which he calls

“ a mean Word to be substituted instead of—
“ *Jehovab.*”

and says the Jews

“ have put it in before *Jehovab*, to strike the
“ Reader's Eye first, and so to prevent his
“ pronouncing the Word *Jehovab* after it.”

It is something very strange that one Word should hinder another's being pronounced ; or that *Adoni*, which is so frequently applied to God without *Jehovab* with it, should be deemed a mean Word with *Jehovab* ; or that it should be foisted into the Text by the Transcriber, [the Transcriber having it in his Power to do what he pleased without any danger of being discovered] to prevent the Word *Jehovab* from being seen *only in about twenty Places* out of some hundreds it occurs in. And if *Adoni* is placed first to prevent the pronouncing of *Jehovab*, may we not argue that where *Jehovab* is

placed first, it is to prevent the pronouncing of *Adoni*; *Jebovab* being placed first to *strike his Eye first?* was the Author reasoning or dreaming here?

2 Sam. viii. 1.

David smote the Philistines, and subdued them. And David took Mether-Ammab out of the Hands of the Philistines.

1 Chron. xviii. 1.

David smote the Philistines and subdued them, and took Gath and her owns out of the hands of the Philistines.

“ Are we to say, with Bishop *Patrick*, that
“ *Mether-Ammab* in *Samuel* is expounded to be
“ *Gath* and its Territories in *Chronicles*. ”

p. 462.

no! I should think not. *Gath* was one of the five Lordships of *Philistia*, and *Ammab* a City or District of the Country belonging to the Tribe of *Benjamin*, 2 Sam. ii. 24. *Gibeab* of *Ammab*, where, I suppose, the *Philistines* till now had had a Garrison in it, or a Fortification by it, called *its Bridle*, as *Mether* signifies; and if so, the next Question is, why doth one sacred Writer mention only the taking of *Gath*, and the other only of this important *Fort*. If *Ammab* was a City near *Gibeon*, or was a District, in which *Gibeab* of *Saul* stood, the *Fort* here, built as one may imagine upon the Defeat and Death of *Saul*, by the *Philistines*, was of Consequence enough to be mentioned, when taken from them by *David*; and *Gath*, one of their Principalities being taken from them was another Proof of *David*’s having subdued the *Philistines*; either of them of Consequence enough to be mentioned alone, and so one sacred Writer instances in one Particular, and the other in another; but why they did not both instance in both; or why this did not mention that, and the other the other, in the Reverse

verse of what they have done, are Questions which I shall leave to wiser People than my self to answer. They were two Places of Importance both of them ; and the taking of either of them a Proof or Instance of *David's* subduing these potent Enemies.

2 Sam. viii. 3.

David smote also Hadadezer the Son of Rehob, King of Zobab, as he went to recover his Border, at the River Euphrates. And *David took from him a thousand [Chariots] and seven Hundred Horsemen, and twenty Thousand Footmen*—And when the *Syrians of Damascus came to succour Hadadezer King of Zobab, David slew of the Syrians two and twenty Thousand Men.*

1 Cbrón. xviii. 3.

David smote Hadarezer King of Zobab, at Hamath, as he went to establish his Dominion by the River Euphrates ; and David took from him a Thousand Chariots, and seven Thousand Horsemen, and twenty Thousand Footmen.—*And when the Syrians of Damascus came to help Hadarezer King of Zobab, David slew of the Syrians two and twenty Thousand Men.*

There were several Engagements with *Hadadezer*, two at least at this Time, one when he went to set up יְהוָה his *Trophy*, [or Memorial of some Victory, as it seems to have been by *Saul's* setting up יְהוָה, when he had destroyed *Amelec*,] at the River *Euphrates*, and the Battle was at *Hamath* ; and another when the *Syrians* came to his Assistance, where that Battle was fought we are not told ; and *Hadadezer* was beat at both, and lost Men at both ; if at one time he lost the Number mentioned in *Samuel*, and at another that mentioned in *Chronicles*, that would clear us of the main Difficulty : But then why are we to conclude that each History did

not intend to give us the sum Total of *Hadadezer's Loss*? And can we suppose that he lost six Thousand three Hundred Horsemen in one Battle more than in the other, and just the same Number of Footmen? Suppose against a second Engagement, he did as *Benbadad* did against *Abab*, numbered Army for Army, like the Army he had lost, with some superstitious Difference as then; so here, 7000 *Riders* (for so רכוב signifies, and not Chariots) for 700; or vice versa, and *David* had the same Success, totally defeating his Army. There are no other Reasons for supposing the Losses mentioned here to have happened at two different Times, than that the whole Loss that *Hadadezer* sustained in this War was not in one Engagement: And when we are told that he lost seventeen Hundred *Riders*, and twenty Thousand Footmen, by one inspired Writer, and by another, that he lost in the same War eight Thousand *Riders*, and the same Number of Footmen, as before; I conclude that one Loss was in one Battle, and the other in another; because so, neither Text contradicts the other; though they do not either mention the whole that happened, one thinking it proper to relate the Loss at one Engagement, and the other the Loss in another Engagement. Upon the same Grounds we shall find an Answer to other Difficulties, which have arisen from supposing that to have happened at one, which really happened at different Times. And I say here, as before, about the taking of the *Metheg-Ammah*, and freeing the whole Tribe of *Benjamin*, and a great Part of *Judah*, from the Awe of a *Pheasantine* Garrison, and the taking of *Gath*, a Place of as much, or perhaps more Consequence, one of which is mentioned in *Samuel*, the other in *Chronicles*; why both are not mentioned in both Places, and so here; why both Losses are not mentioned both in *Samuel* and *Chronicles*, are Questions I leave to

to better Heads to decide upon, if there be any Difficulty in the Case. *Samuel*, says *David*, took a thousand and seven hundred Horsemen, among whom there must have been some רכוב, translated *Chariots*; but רכוב is *Riders* in general, whether on Chariots, Horses, Camels, Mules, or Asses. And פרש translated *Horsemen*, was also a general Term as well as רכוב, and sometimes included רכוב in it, as *Isai.* xxi. 7, 9. though פרש was a Term generally applied to Riders on Horses, as *Ezek.* xxiii. 6, 12. פרשים רכבי סוסים *Horsemen riding on Horses*. And so there might be some among the seventeen hundred, mentioned in *Samuel*; and the Omission of the Word רכוב there will not be so indubitable as it is thought.

“ The same Mistake occurs in 2 *Sam.* x. 18.

“ 700, which 1 *Chron.* xix. 18, is 7000.”

p. 463.

The Repetition of the same thing would rather make one think it was no Mistake, but some thing, though we did not see it, that there was a Reason for. Here, as before, we may suppose several Engagements to have happened during the Campaign, as we know there were in the last. *Hadadezer* had now hired a great Number of Allies of *Rebab*, of *Ishtob*, and *Maacab*, and his Footmen were double the Number he had before, and when he had been beat with 700 *Riders* in one Battle, he might do, as before, resolve to bring ten times as many into the Field against another, and be defeated notwithstanding. The Text doth not say, there were more Engagements than one betwixt *David* and the *Syrians*; but it doth not say the contrary.

The Name of this potent *Syrian*, *David* had these Wars with, is also supposed to be corrupted; for

“ are we to believe that the same Man is pro-

“ perly called *Haddadezer* and *Hadarezer*? ”

I think we have as much Authority to believe he was called by one Name as the other, *viz.* the Word of God; and if he was not properly called, it was their Fault who mis-called him; but **הָדָר עֹזֶר** and **הָדָר עֹזֶר** are Words of the same Signification. And as their Names were *significant*, not like ours, merely Arbitrary, where is the Absurdity in supposing it, when the same Title, as to *Sense* or *Meaning*, is given him in both Words. The Author doth not take Notice that *Damascus* in *Samuel* is *Darmascus* in *Chronicles*; nor is this any uncommon thing in Scripture, as we shall see further by and by; and one Instance of which occurs under the next Head,

2 Sam. xi. 3. <i>Batb̄sheba the Daughter of Eliam.</i>	1 Chron. iii. 5. <i>Batb̄sua the Daughter of Amiel.</i>
---	--

“ with the almost *unparalleled* Transposition
“ of the two first Letters put last.” p. 463.

Not quite *unparalleled*, there are some few other Instances; a *Transposition* indeed, but not properly of the two first Letters, but of the Words that compound the Name. **אֱלֵי-עָם** *God be with me*; and **עַמְיָאֵל** *be with me God*; and in all Probability like some others, was writ and pronounced both Ways, not by Mistake, but by Choice. And however uncouth *Eliam* and *Amiel* may sound as the same Name to the *English* Ear, to the *Hebrew* they are the same. Nor can we conclude that *Sbua* is a Corruption of *Sbeba*, since it was so common for People then to go by different Names; assuming a new Name, or varying the old one upon change of Fortune, Character, Station, or on some other memorable Event. *Sbua* and *Sbeba*, are almost synonymous Words; the one *Ricbes*, the other *Plenty*. Whether that or any other were the Reason

Reason of the Difference in the Name, this Difference, unless it were a single Instance, will not prove it to be a Mistake.

2 Sam. xxi. 19.

And Elbanan the Son of Jaare-Oregim, a Beth-lehemite, slew Goliath of Gath.

1 Cbron. xx. 5.

And Elbanan the Son of Jaor, slew Labmi, the Brother of Goliath, the Gittite.

It is pretended that there is great Perplexity and Inconsistency in these two parellel Places; and some supposed Blunders of the Transcriber are to support numerous Alterations, with Supposition upon Supposition, Guess upon Guess, and a Method of Reasoning that seems to have but little to do with the Rules of sound Criticism. The Text in *Samuel* is produced as,

“ one clear Instance of a Mistake or *Dislocation.*” p. 78.

it having fallen up Stairs and dislocated its Neck, for the long Word *Oregim* belonged originally to the Line below, p. 80. A Mistake in the Translation has bred the Perplexity, and given a Name to *Goliath the Second*, which he was a Stranger to; and robbed the Hero that slew him, of his Country and Pedigree. In the first Place, the *regular Line* in *Chronicles* doth not say, that

“ *Elbanan the Son of Jaor slew Labmi,*” any more than the *corrupted Line* in *Samuel* does that he slew *Bethlabmi*. And

“ *Elbanan the Son of בית לחמי* of the House of *Lebem*,
“ or the *Bethlehemite,*”

is much the same as,

“ *Elbanan את ל'חמי* of *Lebem*, or the *Lehemite.*”

Beth-Lebem is called *Lebem*, 1 Cbron. iv. 22. and what is to our Purpose besides, there is a Place there

there mentioned as famous for a *Linnen-Manufac-ture*, near *Lebem*; as we may suppose that the several Branches of the same Family dwelt near together, Ver. 21. *The Sons of Selab, the Son of Judab, Er the Father of Lacha; and Laada the Father of Mareshab, and the Family of הבוץ* — and the Inhabitants of *Lebem*. Of this Country then was *Elbanan*, and of the Tribe of *Judab* by *Selab*; and the Son of יער says one Text, and of ארגים says the other; both which Words are corrupted, or misplaced, the long Word *Argim* having crept up from the Line below, and יער changed its י into another ע. If this be the same *Elbanan* who is called the *Son of Dodo of Bethlehem*, *Jour*, and *Jori-Argim*, may be the Name of Office belonging to his Father, or Name of the Place he lived in, within the District of *Bethlehem*, and so a local Name; and this Country is called עיר, *Psal. cxxxii. 6. We heard of it at Epbrata, we found it in the Fields of עיר*; and Part of it was called the *Mountain of עיר Jorim*, the very Name here given to the Place where the *Weavers* lived. As this Country was famous for a *Linnen Manufacture*, it is highly probable there were *Weavers* thereabout. עיר is a *Master*, *Mal. ii. 12. עיר to watch, stir up, excite, to pour out as a Tree does its Sap.* Thence as a Noun, a *Wood*, a *Nursery*. Hence עיר a *City*. עיר the *Skin*, from its many excretory Pores; and ערות from the *Evacuations* thence. All its other Senses come under this *Idea*, as it is applied to the *Body* or *Mind*, of *pouring out, exerting, or, &c.* And take יער as a Noun, I would construe it, a *Seminary* or *Nursery*, which in the Plural will be ערים, and in *Construct* עיר. And the Word may be Singular or Plural, as you consider the *Place*, *Part*, or *Portion* of the *Town*, as one; or consisting of many *Shops* or *Workhouses*. Then,

“ *Elbanan*,

“ *Elbanan*, who be- }
 “ longed to the Nur- } and } “ *Elbanan*, who be-
 “ sery of Weavers of } “ longed to the Nur-
 “ *Beth-Lehem*; ” } sery of *Lebem*; ”

will come to the same, and relieve us under the Perplexity the *Versions* had laid us, without having Recourse to imaginary Blunders, Corruptions, Dislocations, and sacrilegious Violence. It may be thought doubtful, perhaps, whether *Jour*, and *Jori-Argim* be the Name of the Place of Abode, personal Name, or Name of Office of *Elbanan*’s Father; but this Branch of the Family of *Selab*, and Country of *Bethlehem*, being famous for a Linen Manufacture, throws such a Light on the *long strange Word, a Participle, Plural, Masculine Weavers, and which confessedly so signifies*, that perhaps its *Dislocation* may not be so certain as it was thought; either way the Integrity of the Text is safe.

What *Elbanan* is celebrated for is slaying *Goliath of Gath*.

“ Now every one knows that *Goliath* the *Gittite* was slain by *David*, and therefore there must have been a Mistake of some Transcriber here; ”

which we may set right by supposing that a Brother of the *Goliath*, whom *David* slew, might after his Death, upon growing as famous as his Brother had been, have the same Title of Honour conferred upon him; succeeding to his Reputation and Title together. *גָּלִית* *Goliath* is a *Taker of Captives*; what more likely than that this young *Gittite*, when grown up after his Brother’s Death, his Equal, and Rival of his Fame, for Valour and warlike Exploits, should be called by the same Name, to keep up the Courage of the Youth, the Hopes of the Nation, and Memory of their Hero. We do

do not always add *the Second* to the Name of a King, or great Man, when speaking of him, though his immediate Predecessor was of the same Name: And unless *Goliath*, was also the Name of this Brother of the other famous *Gittite*, whom *David* slew, he has no Name, for *Labmi* belongs not to him, but to his Betters.

2 Sam. xxii. 13.

Through the Brightness before him were Coals of Fire kindled. The Lord thundered from Heaven; and the Most High uttered his Voice.

Psal. xviii. 12, 13.

At the Brightness that was before him, his thick Clouds passed; Hail-stones and Coals of Fire. The Lord also thundered in the Heavens, and the Highest uttered his Voice, Hail-stones and Coals of Fire.

There are many Variations in the two Copies of this sublime Hymn, and such as could not possibly be owing to the Negligence or Design of the Transcribers. Compare the four or five first Verses, and many other Parts, and whatever Cause the Differences came from, they are too many, and too great, to be ascribed to wilful Alterations; and the Sense shews that they are not accidental Blunders; besides that the LXX, and Vulgate are Guaranties for the two Texts conforming so exactly to them.

The two Verses above are supposed to be corrupted, the Sense being, it is said, imperfect in *Samuel*; and the Words not Sense in the *Psalm*, p. 464: The Passage in one is more full than in the other; but the Sense comes to the same, except that the Hail, which often attends a Thunder Storm, is not mentioned in *Samuel* in this Part of the Hymn, only the Thunder and Lightning.—*Coals of Fire were kindled*—in the Air above: And they

they must consist of the Matter of the Clouds, which are the *Spirit*, and a Mixture of Exhalations from the Earth. The Brightness of the Presence of God kindled these Clouds, and *Coals of Fire*, or Flames, flashed out with Thunder, and oftentimes with *Hail*. What is there defective in Sense here, whether *Hail* be mentioned or not? And though the Word עֲבֵין is wanting, it is necessarily understood in *Coals of Fire*. But I suspect that the Gentleman was not aware that the Text was speaking of Lightning; or that the *Coals of Fire* are Parts of the kindled Cloud.

Next He asks,

“ what Propriety is there in *bis Clouds removed, Hail-stones and Coals of Fire?* Were

“ *Hail-stones and Coals of Fire removed also?*

with other such pertinent Questions, p. 465. from not attending to the Meaning of עֲבֵין translated *removed*. עֲבֵין *ira, furor, furiit, ira exarfit, exca-
duit. Mar. de Cal.* And how proper a Word this is to express the Rage and Fury of the Heavens in a Storm of Thunder and Lightning, whether you consider this Passage, as merely philosophical, or poetical also, bespeaks itself. If *Philosophically*, the Clouds Heat, burst out into Flashes of Fire, with Noise, exceed all Bounds of Restraint, and pass away in Fume. If *Poetically*, the Heavens burn with Anger, and take Part with God in his Quarrel against his Enemies. They are the Glass in which we see the Power and Glory of God; and they are the Instruments of his Vengeance, *Fire and Hail, stormy Wind and Tempest, fulfilling his Word.*

But what is there to connect—*bis Clouds passed, with the next Words, Hail-stones and Coals of Fire?*

“ Were Hail-stones and Coals of Fire removed

“ also :

“ And

“ And whence, and whither, were they re-
“ moved ? ”

“ And how, and at whose Command, did they
“ exist ? ”

I answer. The Clouds *passed*, and Hail and Coals of Fire were formed of course; and the necessary Preposition [*with*, or *in*, or, &c.] may be understood in the Verb; or the same Verb may answer both Parts of the Sentence, though in *Nature* no Connection is necessary with עָבֹר. The *passing* of the Clouds forms the Fire and Hail.

Nor does there want any other Verb than יָתַן in the next Verse in the *Psalm*.

The Highest gave forth his Voice, he gave forth Hail-stones and Coals of Fire.

I do not trouble myself about the *Hemisticks* being *incompleat*, or *over compleat*; for that is only the Transcriber’s Form. It is the Sense and Propriety of the Expressions, and *Variations* I am concerned with: And they are such, that if both Copies of this Thanksgiving were originally the same, it would puzzle one to know which to prefer. What is the Meaning of the two last Questions above, and what Propriety or Pertinency there is in them to the Point in Hand, or any other, I am utterly at a Loss to Guess; and I believe it would puzzle the Author himself to tell.

The Gentleman observes very truly, that this Ode presents to View the greatest Image that ever was expressed in Words. And had he looked at the Picture of it where God came down in Fire within a Cloud and thick Darkness, with Thunder and Lightnings at *Horeb*, he might have had *some Glimpse* of what was meant by it. Or, had he considered the Description of the hieroglyphical Imagery of it, which was set up at the Entrance into the Garden of *Eden*, in the Tabernacle and Temple, and which is described most fully in *Ezekiel*,

it would have helped his Conceptions greatly; He would have seen that there were two Sorts of *Che-
rubim*, the Heavens or the *Aethers*, which are sur-
rounded with thick Darkness, within the Compass
of which they exert a Power uncontrollable by any,
but Him who made them; whose Ministers they
are, and *Representatives* of his *Persons*. And the
sacred Animals, who, as Figures in Miniature, and at
third Hand, stood in Fire in a Cloud, and thick Dark-
ness; which to answer the Purposes of Religion, were
attended with the divine Presence. The original
Words, Gen. iii. ult. *את להט החרב המתהפהכת* *the Fire flaming, flashing, and rolling in upon itself*,
expresses, or necessarily implies all that is said about
the Pavilion, Secret-place, or Tabernacle of God,
and the glorious Appearance he made in it. And
he might have told us what *riding upon Cherubim*,
and *flying upon the Wings of the Wind*, meant. He
would not have said,

“Darkness was as yet his Pavilion;”
or brought in the Waters and Clouds *to conceal the*
divine Glory, when they are the necessary Append-
age of that which displays it. Nor should we have
had the Anticlimax of scattering, removing, and
kindling Clouds into Coals of Fire, when it is neces-
sary they should be first brought together, thick-
ened and condensed, before they can kindle and pass
away. Nor would he have dissolved the Cloud of
Darkness, that *the Blaze of Glory might break forth*,
when no *Blaze of Glory*, unless we could see *Jebo-
vah* himself, can subsist a Moment when the Cloud
is removed, as is plain by Thunder and Lightning.
Nor would he have set the *whole Universe in Flames*
to burn up *David’s Enemies*, unless he had contrived
some Means for *David* to have escaped in the ge-
neral Conflagration. Poor *David* in the midst of
the *whole Universe in Flames*, would have been in
the worst Situation he ever was in his Life.

“ The Blaze of Glory burst forth, and the
“ whole Universe was in Flames.” p. 467.

This sounds something, but means nothing, but what a Man who knew what he was talking about, would be ashamed of. And this is the Man that takes upon him to make us a new Bible.

2 Sam. xxii. Ver. 28.

*Thou art נֵרִי my Lamp, [Marg. Candle] O Je-
bovah.*

“ The Image here seems entirely unworthy the
“ great Father of Lights.” p. 467.

Were this an exact Translation, it would be no more unworthy of God, than a *Way*, a *Door*, a *Tree*, and other such Comparisons ; but the *Hebrew* will admit of a more decent Translation, it not signifying the *Materials*, such as *Oil*, that fed the *Light*, or the *Vessel* that held it ; but in general something giving *Light* : And with the ‘ is several times applied to the Heirs of the House of *David*, through whom the eternal *Light* was conveyed into the *World*.

2 Sam. xxiii. 4. “ וְכָאֹר בְּקָרְבָּן יְהוָה שְׁמַשׁ ” “ cut lux matutina orietur Sol.

“ If we take these Words literally, are they
“ Sense ? ” p. 468.

No ! But if we take in the next Words, בְּקָרְבָּן עֲבוֹת, and correct the Translation, instead of the Text, they will be very good Sense.

He shall arise like the Morning Light :
The Morning Sun without Clouds.
i. e. the Sun in a Morning unobscured by Clouds. This seems to be a very natural Division of the Words, and to express the Glory of the upright Ruler of Men, as it is express, Jud. v. 31.—like the Sun when he goeth forth in his Might ; and this keeps clear of the mighty Difficulty of comparing the Sun to himself ; and wants no Addition to make it Sense, or prove it Prophetical. Had this Gentleman but spent the hundredth Part of the time in examining

examining the Translation, he has in a Parcel of uncorrected MSS. for various Readings, he would soon have seen that the Fault is oftener in our own People than in them who have transmitted the Word of God to us. If it should be said that there wants a **ו** before **וּמֹשֶׁ**, as I construe the Words. I answer it is understood, and points itself out so plain, as not to need a Repetition. And there are many other Instances of the like Nature.

“ These are the last Words of *David*. *Da-*
 “ *vid* the Son of *Jesse* says, The Man who
 “ was raised up for * the Messiah of the God
 “ of *Israel*, the sweet Subject of the Psalms
 “ of *Israel*, says, the Spirit of the Lord
 “ speaketh by me: And his Word is on my
 “ Tongue. The God of *Israel* said to me.
 “ The Strength of *Israel* spake it. He that
 “ ruleth over Men, just, ruling in the Fear of
 “ God: Even he shall rise like the Morning
 “ Light; A Morning Sun without Clouds:
 “ A Plant, &c.

Or thus, as the *Verb Subst.* is generally understood.
Let him that ruleth over Men be just, ruling in the Fear of God: And he shall be as the Light which ariseth in the Morning; the Sun in a Morning without Clouds.

“ A Plant from the Ground watered and cher-
 “ ished with Heat. Although my House is
 “ not right with God, yet has he made with
 “ me an everlasting Covenant, *precious in all*
 “ *Respects*, and sure: Which is all my Salva-
 “ tion and Delight, though it [his House]
 “ prosper not.”

“ For the Sons of *Belial* shall all of them be
 “ rejected as thorns, which cannot be taken
 “ hold of with the Hand; and he that would
 “ meddle with them, must fill it with an Iron,

* On the account of; as Progenitor.

“ and the Handle of the Spear ; and they
 shall be burnt with Fire to put a Stop to
 them.”

David foresaw that his Kingdom on Earth should cease, and that his Sons should become Sons of *Belial*, but comforts himself with that sure Prospect of that perfect Ruler over Men, and of that Kingdom of *David* which should never cease, which God had entailed on him, as heretofore on *Abraham*, *Isaac*, *Jacob*, and *Judah* by Covenant : And compares wicked Rulers to Thorns which you cannot manage with the naked Hand, but must take an Instrument of Iron to them ; and which must be burnt in the Fire to put a Stop to their growing again. I have varied the Translation of this Prophesy of *David*, but not without Reason, as I think, and shall leave it to take its Fate. And I set it before the Reader that he might judge upon the View of the whole, whether it was the Text or Translation that needed the Correction. This Prophesy of *David*, though it point at one perfect Ruler of his own Family, and predicts his Glory, must be true of every one that rules in the Fear of God, proportionably ; as the other Part is of every Son of *Belial*, whom the Sword of Vengeance and Fire await.

2 Sam. xxiii. 8.

הנְבָרִים אֲשֶׁר לְרוֹד יִשְׁבֶּב בְּשִׁבְתַּת תְּחִכָּמָנִי רָאשׁ
 הַשְׁלָשִׁי הוּא עָדִינוּ הַעֲצָנוּ עַל שְׁמָנָה מֵאוֹת חֶלְלָה
 בְּפֵעַם אֶחָד.

1 Chron. xi. 11.

הנְבָרִים אֲשֶׁר לְדָוִיד יִשְׁבָּעֶם בֶּן הַכָּמָן וָנִי רָאשׁ
 הַשְׁלֹשִׁים הוּא עֹוֶר אֶת חַנִּיתֹו עַל שְׁלֹשׁ מֵאוֹת
 חֶלְלָה בְּפֵעַם אֶחָת.

There are many Variations in the *Enumération* of *David's Heroes* in *Samuel* from that in *Chronicles*,

cles, which have greatly perplexed the Translators and Commentators, who differ very much from one another about them; and all for want of the Rules laid down by the famous *Procrustes*, the Father of Criticism, who having a peculiar Knack at clearing up difficult Passages in an Author, by retrenching of Superfluities, and supplying of Deficiencies, gave rise to the Fable of his measuring all his Guests by the same Bed, whom it says, he docked, if they were too long, and stretched out to it if they were too short. This Art, or in the Language of the Fable, this Bed of that famous Robber having been happily discovered very lately, the *Redundancies* and *Defects* in Scripture will be regulated by one true Standard, and all brought to a surprising Uniformity.

There are several Difficulties in other Parts of these two Catalogues of the mighty Men. But

“ in this one Verse, so contradictory in the two
“ Chapters, and so remarkably defective in
“ that of *Samuel*, there are more than in al-
“ most all the other Verses united.” p. 65.

The critical Remarks upon these Difficulties, and the Delucidation of them, are ushered in with two Observations.

“ 1. That the Words of 2 *Cbron.* xi. 11,
“ and of the Verses following in these two
“ Chapters, originally contained the same Sense;”
p. 66.

from whence the Author judiciously infers that,
“ the Sense must have been, and should be still
“ the same in both Places:”

That is, if the Sense was originally the same, it must have been originally the same, and having thus gravely proved the Sense in both Places to have been the same at first, because it was the same at first, he draws another Inference, that

“ one of the two Places must have been corrupted.”
 “ 2. The next Observation—concerns the exact Number, and the superior or inferior Ranks of these celebrated Warriors.—We are expressly assured in *Samuel*, Ver. 39—“ that they were thirty and seven in all :”

Thirty and seven in all—in all what? Why, in that Catalogue, not in the whole, or all that he had; *Samuel* mentions thirty-seven mighty Men; *Chronicles* reckons up a great many more under that Title. And neither *Samuel* nor *Chronicles* mentions *Joab* in their List, though after the Preface they usher it in with, one would naturally expect it. *Samuel* reckons up thirty-seven exclusive of *Joab*. *Chronicles* a great many more, and says of *Odina*, Ver. 42, that he had שלשים Officers, or mighty Men עליין by him, or with him. And in *Chron. xii.* 4, that *Ismaiah*, who is not in this List, was a mighty Man שלשים וועל. There must necessarily therefore be above thirty-seven; so that the exact Number of these Warriors is not determined by those Words of *Samuel*, Ver. ult. *thirty and seven in all*, it only meaning that that Catalogue was of thirty-seven; and so it is without *Joab*, because *Bni-Ishn*, or *Bni-Eshm*, and *Jonathan*, Ver. 32, whom the English makes but one Person of, were two, as appears by *Chron. xxxiv*. *Jonathan* being the Son not of *Bni Ishn*, or *Bni Eshm*, but of *Shaga*. *Samuel* reckons five mighty Men before it comes to *Osheal* the Brother of *Joab*; *Chronicles* reckons but four; so that the two Accounts differ in many material Particulars; and must do originally so, if those reckoned after *Uriab* in *Chronicles* were mighty Men, as they are called. And I suspect it is the Word שלשים that has misled some People; שלשים is three, and it is also a Ruler, Officer, Mar. de Cal. a great Man, Captain. The Reason of which

which possibly, as applied to an Officer of the Army, was his commanding a *third Part*; the Army in the time of Action being divided into three Parts, as *David* divided his when it was going against *Absolam*. And each of those Divisions might, and in all Probability were subdivided into three more, with each a Commander at the Head; and each such Division, and Subdivision, how many soever they might on Occasion divide the Army into, was on a separate Expedition, an Army of itself, and the שְׁלַשׁ at the Head of it, then chief Commander. Be that as it will, שְׁלַשׁ is a Word very frequently used for a Man of Rank in the Army; and שְׁלַשִׁים in the plural Number, Officers, Captains, Commanders. And it is not always to be taken as a numeral *Thirty*; I only premise this, and proceed to a Consideration of the *Variations* which are thought *Corruptions*.

The mighty Men whom David had יְשַׁבּ בְּשִׁבְתָּה, which last Words being very like שְׁבָעַ that follows the Word *David* in *Chronicles* has occasioned great Disputes. Some understanding them of *David*, some of the Hero, who is first mentioned, and whose Name, or one of his Names was שְׁבָעַ, a Word so like יְשַׁבּ בְּשִׁבְתָּה, and standing, as one doth not know how to get it out of one's Head, that it does, in their Place, they are generally understood as spoken of *Ishbom*; and corruptly writ, says our Author for *Ishbom*. I would understand them of *David* himself, that these were the mighty Men he had, when he sat at rest, after his Troubles were ended. שִׁבְתָּה is to rest. And this Phrase here is equivalent to that 2 Sam. vii. 1, when *David sat in his House*. His Wars being ended, and he in quiet Possession of the Throne, his Thoughts being at rest, he takes Account of his mighty Men, and Ranks them according to their Merit.

The first is *Ibboam*, said to be **תְּחִכְמָנִי** in *Samuel* in **בֶּן חִכְמָנוֹנִי** in *Chronicles*, which is a Family or local Name. The Names of many Places are formed with a **תַ**, as may be seen in *Marius's Proper Names*. And **תְּחִכְמָנִי** will be a Person belonging to a Country called **תְּחִכְמָס** or **תְּחִכְמָן**. There is no such Country expressly mentioned in Scripture; but his being called **בֶּן חִכְמָנוֹנִי** in *Chronicles*, and his Father's Name being **זְבָדִיאָל**, the Termination of this Word in both Places leads one to think it a *Patronymic*. We have no more Reason to conclude that the Word is corrupted in *Chronicles*, being without the **ת** there, than we have that **לְהַמִּי**, &c. are, because **בֵּית** is omitted before them. **ת** is the Sign of a *Noun Subst. Fem* and might be dropt when **בְּ** is used to denote the Person's belonging to the Place. Nor is the **ה** wanting before either of the Words, any more than it is before **גָּדְיָה**, &c. *Josb.* i. 12. *et al.*

— **רָאשׁ הַשְׁלָשִׁים** in *Samuel*, **רָאשׁ הַשְׁלָשִׁים** in *Chronicles*, which comes to the same; at least one doth not contradict the other. **רָאשׁ הַשְׁלָשִׁים** is a head or principal *third Man*; by a *third Man* meaning a *Commander* of a third Part; making **שְׁלָשִׁים** the *Adjective* of the Noun **שְׁלָשָׁה** a Commander; and so **שְׁלָשִׁים** is used. We have seen that there were **שְׁלָשִׁים** of several Degrees; of the first, second, and third divisions, and subdivisions; all of whom were subject to **שָׁרֵךְ הַצְבָּא** of course. This *Thacmonite*, whom we are enquiring about, was, says *Samuel*, a *head Third man*, or Commander, as I understand it, of one of the three first Divisions of the Army; the Head or first of the *Third-men*, says its parallel Place in *Chronicles*; and so neither contradicts the other. And we might have concluded from *Samuel*, that he was the first of them, because he is named first. The *LXX* construes it **εγχων το τριτον**, *Chief of a Third*.

—**הוּא עֲדִינוֹ הַעֲצָנוֹ**. There can be no Reason to conclude a Text corrupted, if it can be construed consistently as it stands. These Words at first view would lead one to think that *Odinu* was the Name of this Hero, and *Ojni* to be from the Place of his Abode or Birth; and it is usual in Scripture to introduce another Name of a Place or Person by **הָוָא**, as here: and this great Man might have two Names as well as so many other People: *Odinu* our *Delight*, a Name of Honour, might be one of the Names he was known by, as *Ishbom* was another. There are many Names formed from **עָדָן** and **עָדָן** in Scripture; **עֲדָנָח**, **עֲדָנָא**, **עֲדָן**, **עֲדָנָה**, and others: And we read of the Children of **עָדָן**. Many Names are formed with a **וֹ**, as *Odinu* is, four in this Catalogue. **הַעֲצָנוֹ** may be from **עֹז**, or more likely from **עָצֵין**, Numb. xxxiii. 36. There is an *Ishboam* who came to *David* at *Ziglag*, of the Family of *Korab*, the Name of a Family descended from *Meran* of the Tribe of *Levi*, 1 *Cron.* ix. 19. And when Men have Names given them upon so many Accounts, their Tribe; the head Families of that Tribe; Divisions and Subdivisions of those Families; Name of the Country, Town, Village in that Country; Father, Grandfather; Employment, Character; Accidents in Life, &c. &c. &c. is it to be wonder'd at that we can't always trace the Reason of every Name or Title they bear in Scripture? I have given a literal Construction of the Words as they stand;

“ a Thacobmonite, a bead Captain [Tertiarius,
“ Pagn.] the same is *Odinu* the *Ojnite*.”

—**מָאוֹת חָלָל** **לְשָׁמָנוֹת** **לְ**, because of eight hundred slain at one time. That is, he was appointed the first *Third-man*, or first *Captain*, for occasioning the Death of eight hundred Enemies, who all fell at one Encounter. **לְ** certainly signifies proper, because of, for—“ These are the Names of the mighty

“ Men

"Men which David had setting at Rest ; a Thachmonite, the first Captain, [the same is Odinu of Ezin, or Ojin] because of eight hundred slain at one Time." This literal Construction of the Words makes plain Sense, and it is full enough, to say, he was first Captain because of this Exploit. And if Thachmonite may be from the Country, and Odinu a Name of Honour, and Ojnite, from the Town he lived in or was born at, in that Country, [and a Town there was of that Name] if all this may be so, let any ingenuous Reader determine what Occasion we have for Arabic here ; the Unprejudiced will allow there is none, were it of any Use at all in explaining the Hebrew, in other Instances. But I must take the Liberty to declare, with our Author, p. 94, 95. that I allow no Reader to be *ingenuous* or *unprejudiced*, that doth not think as I do.

— *Eight hundred slain at one time* ; But in *Chronicles* the *eight hundred* are reduced to *three* ; and a Corruption is supposed in one Number or the other. But where is the Contradiction ? This Hero might attack *eight hundred*, and slay *three hundred* with his own hand ; or he might attack *three hundred*, and that might draw on a further Engagement, *five hundred* more coming to their Assistance, who shared the same Fate : Or suppose, for Supposition sake, that there were great Numbers of *Philistines* out a foraging, driving off their Cattle, and ransacking the Houses, covered by a Body of *300* Men, and that *Ishbom* lift up his Spear against them, singly attacked and routed them ; might not *800* fall upon so miraculous an Interposition of God in their Favour ? The whole Glory of the Victory would belong to *Ishbom*, tho' the run-away *Israelites* returned and assisted him in killing the *800*. *Samuel* doth not say, nor imply, that he killed all the *800* himself ; only that they all fell at this Time. And the two Texts together, that he attacked

attacked a Body of 300 himself, and 800 fell in the whole: And they might slay one another, by a divine Fury or Madness sent among them, as when *Gideon* attacked the *Ibmaelites*, *Jonathan* the *Pbili-stines*, and *Jeboshaphat* the *Moabites* and *Ammonites*. *Jonathan* and his Armour-bearer attacked the whole *Pbili-stine* Army, put it to Flight, and *thousands* no doubt fell at that Time. Suppose it had been said that *Jonathan* was honoured so and so, *because of thousands slain at one Time*; and afterwards, *that he lift up his Spear against five hundred slain at one Time*; might we not conclude that the first was the whole Body he attacked, and the second, the Number he slew, himself, or the *Number of the Party he first met with* at this signal and miraculous Defeat of a whole Army? I am arguing upon the Words of the two Texts as they stand *now*; and they construe and explain each other. The History is very concise, just hints at Things, and must have been very voluminous had it descended to Particulars and minute Circumstances. Our Hero *ranked* first because of the Defeat and Slaughter of 800 Men at once; in which 300 were first or more particularly concerned, with respect to the Hero himself; either first slain by him, or who drew on the Engagement, and brought 500 more into the Field to succour them: But we are not told what particular Share *he* or *they*, [the 300] had in this Affair, only there was something particular by their being particularized, and his being honoured upon that account. The Texts want no Correction. When indeed you have made one Alteration, you must make another, and then a third, and so on, to make all correspond: And when you have done all, it is the new Cloth in the old Coat which makes the Rent worse; and you have only a patched-up Business at best.

There

There is another difficulty started about חלל render'd *slain*, which our Author will by no means allow to be proper.

" for according to this rendering, *Ishbom* obtained his Pre-eminence by bravely lifting up his Spear against 300 Men after they were dead, at least after they were wounded."

p. 102.

And this Reasoning he goes upon through a dozen Leaves; and, in spight of common Sense, would make it the *Slayers* instead of the *Slain* in many Places which hardly admit of a Doubt.

— *He lift up his Spear against three hundred Men slain at one time*: Why, does this imply they were slain before, and not after he lift up his Spear? The Genius of every Language differs; and Phrases that are reckoned Beauties in one, literally translated, are scarce Sense in another. Suppose as good a Critick in *Latin* as this Gentleman is in *Hebrew*, should translate, *Sublimi feriam sidera vertice,* *I will hit the Stars with a high Head,* and insist upon it as a true Translation, would he deserve to be confuted or laughed at? The Criticism on חלל is just of this Stamp: But this is a most material Point, he says; and he labours it accordingly. He cites *Judg. xx. 31* p. 106.

" They began to smite of the People the Slain? Can we suppose any of the *Israelites* to be slain before the Battle began?"

I ask again, why we may not as well suppose they were slain by being smitten? If one should say, that *David knocked Goliath down dead with a Stone*, would that imply that he was down and dead before he was hit?

" But as the Verb חלל signifies to fall more tally, the Question is whether *cadent interfeetti* is not an improper Phrase." p. 112.

How

How then shall we construe *inter al.* Ezek. xxxv. 8. *The Slain of the Sword shall fall.* Let us examine but one Place more, Ps. lxxxix. 11. which the Author lays an extraordinary Stress upon, p. 107, 108. *Thou hast broken Rabab in Pieces.* **בְּחָלֵל**.

“ Is there any Propriety in saying that God
“ destroyed the *Egyptians* like dead Men, or
“ like wounded Men? Were not the *Egypt-
“ ians* destroyed? Did they not perish? Can
“ it be said, with any Dignity, that Men slain
“ were destroyed like Men slain? ”

But it is very good Sense to say, that *God trod down Egypt as a slain Man*, sc. is trod down in Battle. We have a great deal more of the like Nature to support the Criticism on **חָלֵל**, which I shall pass over, it being no Pleasure to me to expose such weak fond Stuff. But as no body, who has any Regard for the Scriptures, can bear to see them charged with so much Nonsense, I thought it deserved a few Words. I don't enter into the strict ideal Meaning of **חָלֵל**; for tho' it doth not necessarily signify *slain*, any more than **נִפְלָא** does to *fall mortally*, yet they are supposed to be *slain*, who are said to be **חָלֵל**; as they are, who are said to be *fallen or smitten*, unless the contrary is expressed.

2 Sam. xxiii. 9.

After him was Eleazar the Son of Dodo the Abobite, one of the three mighty Men with David, when they defied the Philistines that were there gathered together to Battle, and the Men of Israel were gone away.— Ver. 11. And after him was Shamah the Son of

Aga

1 Chron. xi. 12.

After him was Eleazar the Son of Dodo the Abobite, who was one of the three-mighties. He was at Pas-damim, and the Philistines were gathered together there to Battle; and there was a Parcel of Ground full of Barley; and the People fled from before the Philistines,

Aga the Hararite: and the *Philistines* were gathered together. *לְחִיה*; and there was a Parcel of Ground full of *עֲרָשִׁים* *lentiles*; and the People fled from the *Philistines*.

Ver. 12. But he stood in the midst of the Ground, and defended it, and slew the *Philistines*. And the Lord wrought a great Victory.

There is a great *mutilation or defect* supposed in this Part of the Text, in *Chronicles*:

“ *A deficiency of one whole Verse, and a Part of two others;*” p. 132.

which would be true enough if one Book were a Copy of the other; and it be a *Mutilation*, because a Piece of History is in one, which is not in the other; the Exploit of *Alozer* in *Samuel*, Ver. 9, 10, is omitted in *Chronicles*; and what is ascribed to *Aga* in *Samuel*, is in *Chronicles* related of *Alozer*, in *Conjunction*, it must be observed, with *some others*.—One of the three mighty Men with *David* *בְּפָלַשְׁתִּים* when they made a Challenge *נָאָסְפּוּ שָׁם* among the *Philistines* where they were gathered together to Battle, and the Men of *Israel* *לְלוּ* were gone away. *שָׁם* is an Adverb of Place. And these Words literally construed say, that these mighty Men (at the Instigation perhaps of *Alozer*) went down to the Place where the *Philistines* were gathered together, the People of *Israel* being fled or flying, upon the Invasion, and boldly challenged the Army on the Spot. Here *Alozer* exerted himself in a most extraordinary Manner, being the Leader in the Proposal and Execution of it, as one may imagine by this particular Honour done him

Philistines, and they set themselves in the midst of that Parcel, and delivered it, and slew the *Philistines*; and the Lord saved them by a great Salvation.

in mentioning his Name only of the three, who thus gloriously exposed themselves, and were miraculously Successful. This literal Construction of the Words frees us from several Difficulties which were *indisputed Corruptions*. If בָּשָׁ be *local*, and may be construed *where*, we do not want the Name of a Place to answer to בָּשָׁ, as

“ relative to some Place antecedently mentioned,” p. 136. and we shall find

“ the nominative Case, or Introduction to the Verb נָמַת.”

And בְּ prefixed to פָּלָשָׁתִים has a regular Construction without making חַרְפָּה answer for it; which as observed, *never admits a בְּ after it*: And בְּחַרְפָּה is not the Name of a Place corruptly writ, but a Word that explains the Nature of the Piece of Heroism this mighty Man, and two unnamed Friends with him, are celebrated for. The *Pbilistines* had made a sudden Invasion, and the Men of *Israel* were flying the Country, when our Heroes went down to the Place where the Enemy was, and challenged the Invaders on the Spot, which produced an Action, and the *Pbilistines* were defeated miraculously through the Valour chiefly, or very eminently, of Alozer, the second Captain in *David's* List of mighty Men. The Confusion in this Part of the sacred Story is owing chiefly to comparing two Pieces of History together, or two Places as parallel, that have no Relation to each other. And the *Misconstruction* of the Passage in *Samuel* seemed to favour the Notion of its being corrupted; especially when you look a little further and see the fame, or *such another Action* recorded of Shamah, which our present Hero himself is celebrated for in *Chronicles*. And this State of the Case removes the other Argument, p. 138.

“ against the present Reading in *Samuel*,”

since

since they did not first *defy*, as supposed, *their dreadful Enemies*, and then *shamefully get up into the Mountains*; but the People flying, as they naturally would, upon a sudden Invasion, these mighty Men by *divine Impulse*, went down to the Enemy, and the Lord gave them a great Victory: Where no such thing is said or hinted at of their first *defying*, and then flying from them. And the Author must design either to call in Question the Veracity of Scripture, or be arguing to no manner of Purpose.

The 10th Verse has no Difficulty in it, for the People being fled, as they were when *Jonathan* and his Armour-bearer *defied*, and *defeated* a whole Army, *returned again*, on seeing the Hand of God on their Enemies, as they did then.

דָּדו' in one Text, and דָּדוֹ in the other; and so אַחֲרָיו in one and אַחֲרֵי in the other, may be no *Corruptions*; since such Variations are so common as to shew it was at the Writer's Discretion which way he should write it. And the only remaining Question is, why this Piece of History [the challenging of the *Pbilstine* Army by *Alozer*] was not recorded in *Chronicles*. To which I say, I cannot tell, I was not by when the Book of *Chronicles* was wrote: But that it is *Sense* and *Grammar* in *Samuel*, as it stands, I hope is shewn; and that it is not confounded with the next Piece of Heroism related in *Chronicles*; except by *an injudicious Parallelism*, I hope will appear presently; though *Alozer* is celebrated for it in one Place and *Shamab* in the other.

Ver. 11.

And after him was *Shamab* the Son of *Aga*, the *Hararite*, and the *Pbilstines* were gathered together לְחִזְקָה, and there was

Ver. 12.

—*Eleazer*, the Son of *Dodo*, the *Abobite*, he was one of the three *Mighties*; he was with *David* at *Pas-dammim*; and

was a Piece of Ground full of Lentiles; and the People fled from the *Pbilistines*: But he stood in the midst of the Ground, and defended it, and slew the *Pbili-stines*, and the Lord wrought a great Victory.

and the *Pbilistines* were gathered together there to Battle; and there was a Parcel of Ground full of Barley; and the People fled from before the *Pbilistines*, and they set themselves in the midst of the Parcel, and delivered it, and slew the *Pbilistines*, and the Lord saved them by a great Salvation.

To clear the Confusion pretended here, it must be observed, as hinted before, that neither *Alozer* nor *Sbamab* were alone when they made that brave stand, *Sbamab* in a Piece of Ground full of *Lentiles* at *Lebi*; and *Alozer* in a Plat of Barley in *Pas-damim*, which we suppose to have been at the same time, and in the same Place. *Pas-damim* is the same Country with *Apas-damim*, 1 Sam. xvii. 1, where the *Pbilistines* were encamped when *David* slew *Goliath*, betwixt *Shocob* and *Azekab*; and *Etam* near *Lebi*, where *Sampson* slew the thousand *Pbilistines*, is mentioned with *Shocob*, 2 Cbron. xi. 6, and other Places thereabout bordering against the *Pbilistines*: And if *Lebi* was in *Pas-damim*, as other Places about it were, this Variation in the Name of the Place is no Corruption.

“ The next Variation is that עֲדַשִּׁים in Sa-
“ muel is שָׁעַרִים in Cchronicles—originally the
“ very same Word;” p. 140.

or which is the same thing, of the same import; or one a general Word, the other specifick. עֲדַשׁ species *Leguminis*, says *Marius*. The Word occurs but a few times, and is put with other Corn, and was boiled for Food. Whether it were a Species

of Barley, as it is called *Barley*, or a general Word for all *Lent-corn*, when not distinguished. This, or some thing of that Nature might be the Case, without supposing one Word writ for another; or, as Mr. *Comings* very justly observes, *the Field might be sowed with both*. The Proofs here of the *Dislocation*, that עֲדַשׂ or שָׂעָרִים has suffered, are not very strong, because *Gen. xi. 31*, is very good Sense as it stands, and the other two Verbs are Plural as well as אָנוּ. The LXX might *mistranslate* without the Authority of a MS. unless every Mis-translation of theirs is to be deemed a *false Reading* in the Copy they translated from; and if that were the Case, they were very unhappy in their Copy; and instead of saying,

“ the LXX read so and so,”
it would be nearer the truth, to say,

“ they *misread* such a Word for such a Word.” I can by no means allow that the Version of the LXX is *plain Proof*, p. 142, that the Verbs, *Cbron.* Ver. 14, were all *Singular*, or that there has been any Alteration made by the Transcribers, because there were more than one, or two either, concerned in this Action. *Chronicles* says *three*, and names *Alozer* for one; and *Samuel* names *Shamah* for one; who the third was is not mentioned, unless *David* himself was the third—he was one of *three brave Men*; he was with *David* in *Pas-damim*—and they set themselves—and they slew the *Philistines*. But says Mr. *Kennicott*,

“ the original History could speak but of one
“ in this Place.”

A strange Assertion this, when it so evidently speaks of three. *Samuel* mentions only one indeed; but that does not imply that there was no other Person concerned, the History not designing to give us an Account of this Action, but only of *Shamah*’s Bravery: But *Chronicles* expressly mentions three; and as

as the Verbs now stand they are some Sort of Proof that the *Text* is right in giving *Alozer* a Share with *Shamah* in this Victory. The Circumstances of this Piece of History as related in *Samuel* and *Chronicles* are so alike, that it is very probable they are one and the same; not that even that is certain. The *Pbilistines* on an Invasion, might send out several Parties to forage; and *Alozer*, and two brave Friends, might attack one Party in one Field, and *Shamah* another Party in another Field; or the Actions might happen upon different Invasions: The *Pbilistines* invaded *Israel* *above once*, and went out to forage *above one* way at once. But supposing them the same Action, why must either of the Places be *corrupted*, because one mentions only one of the Heroes by Name, and the other mentions only another? The two Histories seem to have been preserved not to confront and confound, but to illustrate and confirm each other; and they do so as they stand; though there may be Mistakes of the Transcribers in both of them; but not so many I hope as has been thought. The only *remaining Corruption* here is of *wy'* into *yw'*, p. 143. The Proofs of this Corruption are, 1st, Because it is *wy'* in *Samuel*, and *εποντε* in the LXX. 2dly. The *Hipbil Future* of *yw'* is *y'w'*. And lastly, it makes no Sense as it stands. Invincible Arguments these, till it be considered, that *Chronicles* and *Samuel* are of equal Authority; and the LXX of none at all against the *Original*: And next that if it cannot be the *Hipbil-future*, it may be the *Hipbil-preter*, or what you please to call it, as it is *Exod.* ii. 17, 14, 30, *Jud.* iii. 31, and elsewhere. And lastly, that though a literal Construction of the Words be, and the *Lord* *saved a great Salvation*, that yet the Context and Genius of the Language will justify you in supplying both the *Pronoun them*, and the *Preposition by*; both of which are so frequently under-

stood in *Hebrew*, and all other Languages, that this obvious Answer should have been taken notice of ; not to say that the *Hebrew* generally *predicates the same Verb of the same Noun* ; as to *sojourn* a *sojourning* ; *die*, a *Death* ; *create*, a *Creation* ; *slay* a *slaying* ; *brick* *Bricks*, &c. See Mr. *Comings*, p. 44 ; and so *deliver* a *Deliverance*, would be as the *LXX* rightly translate it, in Greek, *to work a Deliverance*.

2 Sam. xxiii. 13.

וַיָּרֹדוּ שְׁלֹשִׁים מִהִלְשִׁים רַאשׁ. and came to to *David* to the Cave of *Adullam* ; and *חַיִת* of the *Pbilstines* pitched in the Valley of *Repbaim*.

1 Chron. xi. 15.

וַיָּרֹדוּ שְׁלֹשָׁה מִן הַשְׁלֹשִׁים רַאשׁ עַל הַצָּר to *David* to the Cave of *Adullam*, and the Hosts of the *Pbilstines* encamped in the Valley of *Repbaim*.

The Text in *Samuel* must be wrong,

“ because it is impossible the Historian should say—thirty out of the thirty went down.”

p. 145.

But he might say that *thirty* of the *Captains*, or Head Officers of the Army, came down. *Chronicles* says, *three* of these *Captains* came down, and takes no notice of any more, because three only are concerned in the bold Adventure recorded here : And *Sam.* Ver. 17, says, *these things* did שְׁלֹשַׁת הַנְּבָרִים, *three* of the *mighty Men*, without giving Evidence against itself ; because thirty might come down, and be of great Service, though three only jeopardized their Lives to Death at *Bethlehem*. But suppose we were to render the contested Words in *Samuel* ; and some Officers from among the principal Officers went down. I see not what could be objected ; for that שְׁלֹשִׁים does signify Officers of the Army,

Army, is certain ; and *Officers* from among the principal Officers in *Samuel*, would differ from *Chronicles* only in not specifying the exact Number, till Ver. 17, where it says, *three of them* only were concerned in breaking through the *Pbilstine* Army. And the whole Confusion arises here from not considering that **שְׁלַשִׁים** may signify *Officers*, as well as *thirty*. Take the Word in the former Sense, and all is plain without any Contradiction betwixt the two Texts, which are both very intelligible as they stand, without the Help of any Correction, or *forced Construction*, which making **רְאֵשׁ** to agree with **שְׁלַשָׁה** instead of **הַשְׁלַשִׁים** looks so much like, that we need not stand to confute it, it being only a forced Put upon the Mis-construction of **שְׁלַשִׁים**. To go on—*some of the principal Officers*, says *Samuel*; *three of them* says *Chronicles*, as *Samuel* does afterwards, *came down to David* **אֶל קֶצֶר** *Samuel*; but **עַל הַצֵּר** says *Chronicles*: As they would make the Words parellel to each other, and so **אֶל קֶצֶר** a *Corruption*;

“ because those Words never signify *in the time of Harvest*, throughout the Bible.”

p. 148.

But they may signify *in Harvest*. And *Harvest*, for *the time of Harvest*, is frequent. *Exod.* xxxiv. 21. *In Harvest thou shalt rest*. *Prov.* vi. 8. *Isai.* ix. 3, &c. And so our Author’s Assertion, that *Harvest* never signifies the *time of Harvest*, is too hasty ; unless he would get off by saying that **אֶל קֶצֶר** occurs no where else, which would be but quibbling, except he could prove that **אֶל** doth not signify *in or to*.

The *Pbilstines* being encamped in the fruitful Valley of *Rephaim*, the mention of *Harvest* here would lead one to think that they had made a sudden Invasion in order to carry off the Corn ; and that *David* had entrenched himself at *Adullam*, in

the best manner he could, in order to protect the Harvest; and therefore these brave Men came down to him עַל הַצָּר as Mr. *Comings* construes it, I think very justly, *over the Rock into the Cave of Adullam to him*; or *upon the Rocks*, as *1 Sam. xxiv. 3.* The Enemy was Master of the open Country, and these Heroes came over the Rock, the Cave was under; a Matter of as much Difficulty it is likely, as there was Danger in the Cave.

The next Word is חִת a *corrupted Word* no doubt, for having an ח in it, as מְחַנָּה, the Word in *Chronicles* has; and ח being like the ח, the Scribe mistook one Word for the other: Our Author condemns it, because

“ it doth not appear that it ought for certain
“ to be rendered a Troop, any where in the
“ Bible :”

But it ought for certain to be rendered Cætus, Congregatio, Conventus, or something equivalent. See *Psal. lxviii. 11, 31. lxxiv. 19.* which Company or Collection of People might be an Army, or Part of an Army: And so here is a *Variation*, but not the Shadow of a Corruption. But further.

“ it is never once rendered ταγμα by the LXX.
“ but in this Place ;”

and if it had not been rendered so here, nobody need have been at a Loss for the Meaning; for it doth not signify ταγμα here. The whole of this Criticism comes to this, חִת doth not signify an *armed Body*, therefore it doth not signify a *Company of Men*. Upon such slight Grounds, and inconclusive Arguments, does this Gentleman convict his Bible of *Corruption*.

All the Differences in the next two Verses are, that נִצְבֵּב in *Samuel* is נִצְבֵּב in *Chronicles*, and בֵּית לְחָסָב in *Chronicles*, is only בֵּית לְחָסָב in *Samuel*; and יְתָאוּ in *Chronicles*, is יְתָאוּ in *Samuel*;

muell; and in one is בָּאָר בָּוָר in the other, which our Author would find Mistakes if he could. As to his objecting to נְצִיב as a proper Word for *stationary Soldiers*, I blush at his Assurance or Ignorance; see *Comings*, p. 46. בָּ is not wanting before *Bethlehem*, if Usage be any Authority. יְהִאוּ or יְתִאוּ is a common Case with that, and perhaps every *Verb* in the Tongue. בָּאָר and בָּוָר are two Words, which, though they differ in their *ideal Signification*, are both applicable to Places *hollowed*, and *cleared out* in the Ground. בָּאָר is to make a Hole or Cavity, being used to writing with a Style on Wax Tables; and בָּר is to *cleanse*, or *clear out*; and so are both very proper Words for a Hole, Hollow, or Cavity in the Ground, whether Water were at the Bottom of it or no; and there wants no *boleum exprest* or *understood*, whether it be with or without the י; for the Sense is the same, though the Root be different.

The next Verse [Ver. 16.] in *Samuel* has נְסִיב, which in *Chronicles* is נְסִיךְ, on which our Author remarks, that

“ we may safely admit the *latter* as the *truest Word*, since it contains the three original and radical Letters of the Verb;” p. 154.

and wishes that all the radical Letters were restored,

“ which have been omitted by the *Masorets*,

“ and supplied by their *Punctuations*:”

Though he has not the Shadow of Evidence, that any were ever omitted. Dr. *Robertson* mentions this as a thing he took for granted, but brings no Proof; I with Pleasure subscribe to the honourable mention our Author makes of the learned Doctor. I should be glad to see the poetic Parts of Scripture made Verse of, but am loth to make a Song of the whole; which the whole would be, had the *Masorets*, or any other Set of Men, ever had it in their Power to make so many, and such material

Alterations in the sacred Scriptures, without being detected. When did they do this, and where? Are all the MSS. lost that could prove it? No Writer inform us of it? Yes,

“ the older MSS. are very valuable, as they contain many of the *Matres Lectionis*; which, as the rabbinical Punctuation began more and more to obtain—began more and more to be omitted.” Mr. Kennicott, p. 303.

So then his older MSS. are *Masoretic*, as well as those our present Text is taken from: And we have no Proof of this *Licentious Licence* taken by the *Masorets*, but that some older MSS. retain more of them, than the later ones; but still both the older and the later were writ under *Masoretic* Influence, or they would have retained the discarded Letters in every Place, whence *Masoretic* Presumption has outed them. This is a terrible Case: None of these Letters are to be acknowledged as genuine which a Point doth not sanctify; and hundreds upon hundreds are to be thrust into the Text where the Synagogue of Satan has pointed out the Places to put them in. The diabolical Invention of Punctuation is to be restored; or what is infinitely worse, the Text is to be corrected by the Points, and the next Edition of the Bible would be *all pointed*, without a *Point* being seen. Whatever your Arab Christians may think of such a Proposal, it could come only from him who is most successful when he plays least in Sight: A Matter indeed which deserves serious Consideration, since if these Letters are frequently omitted, and if the Omission of them will sometimes; nay, in Matters where the Evidence of our Faith is concerned, give a Word a very different Meaning, it seems truly adviseable for Men of Hebrew Learning to acquaint themselves, not with the rabbinical Points, but natural Rules of the

Language ; and take the Construction of Scripture out of the Hands of those blind Guides, the apostate Jews. And here I cannot help expressing my Compassion, rather than Contempt, because he does not seem to know better, for that poor affected Enthusiast *Fortin*, who condemns the Study of the *Hebrew itself*, under the Title of *cabalistical Learning*, which it is as opposite to, as Light to Darkness.

But to return and go on with,

2 Sam. xxiii. 17.

—He would not drink thereof, but poured it out unto the Lord ; and said, *חלילה לי י'וה מעשה* that I should do this, *הדם* the Blood of the Men that went in Jeopardy of their Lives ? Therefore he would not drink it.

1 Chron. xi. 19.

But *David* would not drink it, but poured it out unto the Lord. And he said *חלילה לי מלאה* that I should do this thing. *The Blood of these Men shall I drink ?—at the Hazard of their Lives* —for at the Hazard of their Lives they brought it ; and he would not drink it.

These two Verses it is conjectured were originally the same, and consequently corrupted now.

“ The Reading in *Samuel* is broken, and
“ wants all that *spirited Emphasis*, which gives
“ so much Beauty to the other.” p. 156.

and first *אשחת* has been lost—*The Lord forbid it me, that I should do this, the Blood of Men that went at the Hazard of their Lives ?* They brought him the Water to drink, and he refuses with great Earnestness to taste it. The Break in the Sense, or Want of the Verb, adds a *Spirit to the Emphasis* ; such Breaks and half Sentences being always the Language of Emotion and Earnestness. *Chronicles*

icles has the Verb—*Shall I drink the Blood of these Men in their Bodies? For at the Hazard of their Lives they have brought it.* There is a Beauty in the original Expression here not to be retained in a Translation; נַפְשׁ is the animal Frame, and as such is the Life; and בְּנַפְשׁ is, at the Hazard of that Frame, as well as in it. He conceived it drinking their Blood as it was running in their very Veins, to drink the Water they had fetched at the evident Hazard of that Blood. If you do not construe בְּנַפְשׁתָךְ as I do, you must make such another Break, as is complained of in *Samuel*.—*Shall I drink the Blood of these Men? at the Hazard of their Lives! when at the Hazard of their Lives they brought it?* The Sense comes to the same either way. The Sentence is not compleat in *Samuel*, and perhaps not in *Chronicles*; but the Reason is apparent, it was *David's* Emotion of Spirit, not the Transcriber's Blunder that left them so.

One Text says, *they went*, the other, *they brought* the Water at the Hazard of their Lives; so that הַהֲלָכִים in *Samuel*, is acknowledged in Substance in *Chronicles*. Here [p. 157.]

“ *הַהֲלָכִים* seems foisted in by some Transcriber;”

for no other Reason but because the Author was pleased to say so. But p. 539, he condescends to say,

“ I am now inclined to think *הַהֲלָכִים* to be “ genuine;”

which is carrying the Fastus of Criticism, and his own Authority, though so great a Man, rather too high—*It seems to me, therefore it is foisted in.* Now *I am inclined to think otherwise; therefore it is genuine.* We dare not ask why *it seemed foisted in*; nor why he is now inclined to think otherwise. *Ipse dixit* is sufficient in *Bentley*.

Lastly,

Lastly, 'דָּוֹתָה' in *Samuel* is **מַלְהָדֵי** in *Chronicles*, and both wrong; for

" it doth not appear that **אֱלֹהִים** is ever used

" in this solemn Form of Appeal to the

" Deity, the Word being constantly **יְהוָה** ;"

except where neither one Word nor the other is used; which is generally the Case: And the shortest way would have been to have struck them both out as having been *foisted* in by the Transcriber, in this and *three other* Places; especially in *Sam.* xiv. 45, where there is no *Mem* prefixed. See *Comings*, P. 48.

2 *Sam.* xxiii. 18.

And *Abišbi*, the Brother of *Joab*, the Son of *Zerviab*, **רָאשׁ הַשְׁלָשׁ**; and he lift up his Spear against three hundred **חַלְלָה**; and had a *Name* among a *Three*. Of a *three*, he was indeed most honourable, and was their Captain. But to *the* three he attained not.

1 *Chron.* xi. 20, 21.

And *Abišbi* the Brother of *Joab*, he was **רָאשׁ הַשְׁלֹשָׁה**; and he lift up his Spear against three hundred **חַלְלָה**, and had not a *Name* among the *three*. He was the most honourable of the *second three*, and was their Captain; but to *the three* he attained not.

First, *Abišbi* in *Samuel* is writ *Abišbi* in *Chronicles*; but the Name is the same either way, as **דוֹד** and **דוֹיד** are. And such Variations in Names are so frequent, that we cannot suppose them accidental. **שְׁלָשׁ** doth not often occur with a *Vau*; but with the **ו** may be a *Third*, as **שְׁלָשִׁי** is; but construe it *three*—he was *Head of a Three*: And so both Texts say, he was a *Head—third Man*, but not of the first Rank; as it follows, he was the most honourable of the *three*—as **שְׁלָשִׁים** and **אֶרֶבֶעֶם**—**בְּשָׁנִים**—as **שְׁלָשִׁים** and **אֶרֶבֶעֶם**—are construed the *third* and *fourth Generation*; but literally are the *Thirds* and *Fourths*; and so **שָׁנִים** will

will be the *Seconds*, or second Rank, which comes to the same, by regular Construction, as is contended for, viz. that *Abišbi* was reckoned Chief of a Second Three—of the *Three among the Seconds*, not the *Primals*.

I have put these four Verses together, which our Author divides, because it takes off, when seen together, in a great measure, that direct Contradiction between the latter Parts of the 18th of *Samuel*, and 26th of *Chronicles*, because though they contradict point Blank when set as parellel to each other; yet the four whole Verses, when compared, as to Sense, do not contradict each other; for both Passages say, that *Abišbi* had a Name among three, and had not a Name among three; which is all the two *contradictory* Clauses say; and this is immediately explained: And I have kept up the Difference betwixt the first and second Three, by calling the first *the Three*, and the second *a Three*, which Custom will justify.

It is surprising that Prejudice should carry Mr. *Kennicott* so far as to labour at making a Contradiction between the two Texts here; and וְלֹא in *Chronicles*, an evident Corruption of וְלֹו in *Samuel*; which if it be, both *Samuel* must contradict *Samuel*, and *Chronicles*, *Chronicles*; for each of them say in the same Breath, just what they say, when thus opposed.

חכִי, which I translate indeed, is Affirmative, as well as Interrogative. See *Mar. de Cal.*

Our next Hero is *Beniabu*, *Samuel*; but *Beniab*, *Chronicles*: Many other Names are writ sometimes with, and sometimes without the *י*, whether it be post fixed, or inserted; the Reason of which is very obvious; the *Pronoun* *י* signifying *bis* or *bim*, may be understood or exprest in the Name of a Person, as in any other Sentence: So בְּנֵי־הָוּ *God build him up*, or בְּנֵי־חָ *God build*, sc. *him*, to whom the

Name

Name is given; many Instances of this kind are cited below, at 2 Kings ix. 16, &c. the Reason of which is apparent in Hebrew though not in English. And this as well as many others we meet with in Mr. Kennicott, we may call English Objections to the Hebrew Language.

Benaibū is said in *Chronicles*, Ver. 22, to be Son of אִישׁ חִילָּרְבָּ פָּעָלִים but *Samuel*, Ver. 20, of a *Man* חִילָּרְבָּ פָּעָלִים; and

“ the Word חִילָּרְבָּ is evidently defective for want of the ל; ” p. 168.

but not in Sense; for חִילָּרְבָּ is robust, active, *Psal. xxxviii. 20*, *mine Enemies are lively, and they are strong*: A *Man* of *Life*, and a *Man* of *Courage*, are much the same; to which both Texts add, *who had done many Deeds*. Among others he slew את שני אַרְיָאֵל the two *Ariels of Moab*; called אַרְיָאֵל in one Text, without a ה, which is often omitted in Names, as ה is; and this Word occurs without the ה, *Numb. xxvi. 17*; and with it *Ezr. viii. 16*. אַרְיָאֵל is *God the Light*. God the *Lyon*. The Lyon was the Emblem of the Light, both of the created, and the eternal Light. And these two Persons, it is likely were so called, after the Name of their God, as was common. All the Powers and Attributes of God, and all their Hopes in him, were recorded in the Names of Persons, both among Believers and Unbelievers.

This mighty Man slew also an *Egyptian, a Man of Stature, five Cubits high*, says *Chronicles, an Egyptian* אֲשֶׁר מְרָאָה who was a *Sight or Monster*, says *Samuel*; as *Naomi* called herself a *Sight, a Monster*, on another Account; because she was become a thing to be stared at, for her strange Reverse of Fortune, *Ruth i. 20*. But says Mr. Kennicott,

“ the

“ the first שָׁרֵךְ in *Samuel* must have been writ
“ by a very careless Transferber, instead of
“ שָׁנָךְ.” p. 172.

When he has, for no other Reason, but mistaking the plainest Words, altered the Text ; he construes it, *a Man of great Aspect*, which is neither the Sense of the Hebrew, nor is it English. No doubt this huge Man looked as big as he could ; but it is not the Bigness of his Looks, but Bulk of his Body, which is spoke of. *Aspect* expresses neither one nor the other : Whereas the Hebrew, literally translated, as it stands, is very expressive, and the two Texts very consistent. But it *must be* wrong, notwithstanding. He will tell us why another time. In the mean time we may rest satisfied, that in all these Differences, and several others, there is no Contradiction ; for they are only such Variations as the different Stile of different Writers and Grammar will admit of.

2 Sam. xxiii 23.

He was honoured
בֶּן־הַשְׁלֹשִׁים, but to
the Three he attained
not. And David set
him. אל מִשְׁמָעָתוֹ.

1 Chron. xi. 25.

Behold he was honour-
ed מִן־הַשְׁלֹשִׁים, but
to the Three he attained
not. And David set
him. על מִשְׁמָעָתוֹ.

Chronicles has distinguished no *Thirty* of a separate Order, and *שְׁלֹשִׁים* and *שְׁלֹשִׁים* are equivalent. *Ajabal, the Brother of Joab, was among the Officers, Sam. Ver. 24.* *גָּבְרִי חַילִּישׁ* the Commanders of the Armies, *Chron. Ver. 26*, or rather of the Divisions and Subdivisions of the Army. *Samuel* reckons thirty-seven of these Commanders [without mentioning Joab,] amongst whom two Threes are distinguished ; *Chronicles* reckons up a great Number under these Titles, without any Preference given to a *Thirty* of them. So that these

שְׁלָשִׁים were so called, not from their Number of *Thirty*, as has been imagined, and from whence great Confusion has arisen; but from their *Office*. And there are two things that seem to have confirmed the Notion of an Order of *Thirty*, viz. the Number of thirty-two in *Samuel*, exclusive of *Odi-nu*, *Alozer*, *Sbamab*, *Abisbi*, and *Benaibu*; which bringing the Number so near to one Sense of שְׁלָשִׁים, easily led People to try to make out the Six, or two *Trees*, and then thirty more with *Joab* at the Head of all, for the 37th, or first of the thirty-seven. Here are *three* head Officers mentioned first, in the LXX Stile, *αρχοντες των τριτων*, Commanders of the three head Divisions of the Army: Then three other head Officers, each of whom is called a Head or Chief, as being Heads or Chiefs of Parties; Commanders of a *third Part*, of each Sub-division, of the three principal triple Divisions of the Army; who are distinguished from the first Three, by being called, *secondary Tertiani*, *Third-men*, or Commanders of a Third. Of all these *Benaibu* was the first; and among these, *tbœ* seem to have had the same Rank or Preference, as the first three, had among them all.

אֶל מִשְׁמָעָתוֹ, which is objected to, p. 176, is as proper as על מִשְׁמָעָתוֹ; if *Usage* will justify a Phrase, the two Prepositions being so frequently used one for the other. מִשְׁמָעָה signifies *Audience*: If it means that *Benaibu* was to attend those who came for an Audience—be appointed him אֶל to, or לְי over, the Audience, will come to the same. If it means the Place where the Audience was given—be placed him אֶל in, or לְי over, the Audience-room, will come again to the same. If it means the receiving and giving out Orders—he appointed him to, or he appointed him over it, is still the same; so that I look

look upon this Condemnation of אל as an arbitrary Sentence, and hope the Prisoner will be pardoned.

2 Sam. xxiii. 24. Osbeal the Brother of Joab בשלשיכם.	1 Chron. xi. 26. נבר חיליס were Osbeal the Brother of Joab, &c.
---	--

I have construed these Words just above, and cite them again, because we are told, p. 178, that

“ the Author of *Chronicles* barely sets him at
“ the Head of the following thirty:—”

And ask, why at the Head of *tbirty*, rather than of twenty, or forty? For *Chronicles* reckons up above forty in this Chapter, and sets him at the head of them all; and in the next he reckons up a great many more. And it is certain he has no Regard to an *exact Number of Thirty*, as Mr. Kennicott observes himself, but the Page before this, though he forgets it here, and makes him set *Osbeal* at the head of a *Thirty*—barely.

2 Sam. xxiii. 25. Sbamab the Harodite, החרדי.	1 Chron. xi. 27. Sbammut the Erodite, ההרודי.
---	---

This Officer's Name is said to be **שמעה** in the *Singular*, in one Place, and **שמות** *Plural* in the other. But there is nothing particular in this, for many other Names are sometimes *Singular*, and sometimes *Plural*.

He is said to be of *Harod*, a Town or Village famous for a Fountain, not far from Mount *Shepper*, where *Israel* encamped when they coasted round the Land of *Edom*, and *Gideon*, before he fought with the *Midianites*. *Harod* signifies *Trembling*; why the Place was so called is only a Matter of Conjecture; perhaps from the *Israelites* trembling there

there when attacked by *Arad*; as this Place was also called חֲרֵד *Conquest*, if the parellel Place in *Cbronicles* be *uncorrupt*; perhaps the Name was changed by *Gideon*, or by *Moses* before, upon their Conquest over the Enemy. We are not told, that I recollect, why it was called *Trembling*; nor are we, why this or any other Place was called *Conquest*. But as *Sbamah* was of *Harod*, and *Erod* both, either the Place went by the two Names, for some such Reason as I have assigned; or when comprehended the other, as a Town or Village in it—or *the Text may be corrupted*: But as there is no Reason to suppose it corrupted, meerly because we know nothing of the matter, which is all the Reason Mr. *Kennicott* gives, p. 181, for supposing a Corruption here, I shall venture to say that both Words *may be right*: And this *Sbamah* will be distinguished from both the other, by the *Patronymic*, they being הַחֲרִירִים *Eerites*, of Mount *Eer*, or *the Mountain*, by way of *Eminence*, whatever Mountain it mean, whether that where *Aaron* died, or any other.

The next Hero in *Samuel* is *Alika*, of *Harod*, as the last was; the next in *Cbronicles* is *Heletz* הַפְלֹנִי the *Pelonite*; called in *Samuel* הַפְלָטִי the *Paltite*; and so *Alika* is omitted in *Cbronicles*; and if it be the same *Heletz* in both Places, he is distinguished by different Family, or local Names, as so many others are. But Mr. *Kennicott* concludes at once, that הַפְלָטִי is corrupted, because *Heletz* is called a *Pelonite* in another Place also, *viz.* 1 Ch. xxvii. 10. where he is said to belong to the Tribe of *Epbraim*, within whose Territories lay a District called, *Josh.* xvi. 3. יַפְלָטִי; whence in all probability this mighty Man was called the *Peltite*; at least we have just the same Reason to conclude so, as we have that any one Man in the whole Catalogue belonged to the Country, Town, Family, or, &c. his second

Name bespeaks him of. And it is a hasty Conclusion, p. 184, that

“ The *Tetb* is corruptly made up of the original *Vau* and *Nun*—ט of ינ.”

Consider the Bible as a common Book, and I should call this a whimsical Surmise; but as it is the Word of God, it is shocking Presumption to adulterate the Letters of it to indulge an idle Fancy at conjecturing. That one Letter may be mistaken for another, may be readily granted, and that the Writer when he looked over his Copy again, might see his Blunder, and correct it, will be as readily granted: And to infer that a Mistake was actually made, because it might be, though very common with our Author, is not sound Reasoning. *Salmab* writ also *Salmon*, is no parellel Case to this, and may be easily accounted for, because they are both feminine Terminations of the same Noun. *Salmab* is also writ with נ, as other Names in נ also are, which seems harder to account for at this Distance of Time. But a Person should be extremely well acquainted with many Particulars we must now be Strangers to, before he should so hastily take upon him to condemn the Text as corrupted, because he knows not the Reason of every Title and Name in Scripture.

‘**מִבְנֵי הַחַשְׁתִּי**’ *Samuel* Ver. 27, for which we have ‘**סִבְכֵי הַחַשְׁתִּי**’ *Chronicles* Ver. 29, is condemned at first Sight, as the Reader will conclude, *Sibci* being certainly the Name of a famous *Hushite*, and who slew one of the Giants of *Gath*; and was, I doubt not the Name of the *Hushite* in *Samuel*; for he has no Name there; only among the other mighty Men of *David* is reckoned a *Hushite*; for is equivalent to ב, only is Singular or Plural, as the Context requires. 1 *Cron.* xii. 8, and of the *Gadites*, i e. some of the *Gadites*; and xxvii. 10. *Heletz the Pelonite*, of the Sons of *Ephraim*, or the

the *Ephramite*; as our Author himself construes **בן חכמוני** a *Hacmonite*: The LXX construe it *επι των γαων*, which is a true literal Translation, but not full enough in *Greek*, unless some Word had been before it, which is not necessary in the *Hebrew*: So *Samuel* says a *Hushite* was one of the mighty Men, and *Chronicles*, *Sibci the Hushite*—without contradicting each other. And

“ the evident Corruption there” p. 189.
is bred like so many others in *the misconstruction* of the Words: I pass over the Objections to other Names, till we come to *Ver. 32* of *Samuel*, and *34* of *Chronicles*; because these great Men having different Names is no Proof of Corruptions in the Texts, almost all of them having so; or at least so many, that no Argument can be raised from thence.

Samuel Ver. 32. בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל. Chronicles Ver. 34. בְּנֵי הַשְׁׂדֵה הַגְּזֹונִי.

“ It scarce needs Observation that the Words
“ *filii Jason* cannot contain the Name of any
“ Man.” p. 201.

But it needs Proof, and some should have been brought; for why can not **בְּנֵי** *filii* be the Name of a Man in Composition here, as well as in **בְּנֵי עַמִּן**, **בְּנֵינוּ**; or as **בְּנֵי** alone, several Times; and many other *plural* Words? And may be *Local*, for there was such a Place mentioned, *Isai. xxxvii. 12*, and there is no Occasion to alter it to the *biblic Name*, **גְּזֹונִי**, or change a **י** into a **ל**, as aimed at, p. 203. But I am tired of confuting such Guesses and Surmises; and concerned for an Author who can fill the Copies of the Bible with so many Blunders upon such slight and trivial Grounds; and shall make no more Remarks upon his *Criticisms* on this Catalogue of Names; only observe, that the Author has misled himself frequently by setting as parallel several Passages, as

well as Names of Persons, in these two Chapters, which are not so. And his general Supposition of an Order of *Thirty*, besides two *Trees*, which *Chronicles* has no Regard to, is what has drove him to the Necessity of making so free with the Text. They that will read over the few Chapters where the Genealogies, and Names of Persons, and Places are recorded, will soon see what a Labyrinth the Gentleman has got into, and how many Threads are wanting to lead him safe out again. Whether he has approached the sacred Text with *Veneration*, let the Liberties he has taken with it speak for themselves. Whether his Zeal be according to Knowledge, and he be *as yet qualified to ascertain the original Words, and true Sense of Scripture*, I leave to the Reader's Judgment, and his own further Consideration, and go on with the Passages marked out as corrupted, in the regular Order they stand in *The Index of Texts*; and shall readily acknowledge as a Blunder of the Transcriber, what appears so; but not think myself obliged to make my own little Skill in the Text the Measure of every Body's else, and *peremptorily* condemn as *absolutely corrupted*, or *inexplicable*, what I do not understand.

The next Passage that offers itself is,

2 Sam. xxiv. 13. A seven Years Famine, which 1 Chron. xxi. 12, is but a three Years Famine. I do not cite this to dispute with our Author the Difference betwixt *seven* and *three*, which he urges against the Integrity of the Hebrew Text, with so much Complacency, and affected Contempt of the Defenders of it, p. 472—474; but to ask him with Mr. *Comings*, why he kept back an Interpretation, which seems to remove the Difficulty, and is commonly thought to do so? And to ask him also, whether he thinks the many Variations in the Wording of the Message to *David*, in the two Passages,

sages, be all owing to the Blunders of Transcribers, having been originally the same? Because he asks —

“ Can there be a Doubt of a Mistake here? ”

“ Did the Prophet *Gad* deliver this Message

“ twice? If only once, did he propose both

“ seven and three Years of Famine? ”

I answer, he might propose only three Years; and the inspired Writer call it seven, if with the Years of the Famine just elapsed, three more would make seven; or it might be *vice versa*; the Prophet might call it seven, and the sacred Historian call it *three* only; because three only additional Years of Famine were to come.—*Chronicles*, thus says *Jebovab*, *Choose thee either three Years, or, &c. Samuel*, so *Gad* came to *David*, and told him, and said unto him, *Shall seven Years of Famine come unto thee in thy Land*, or, &c. *Chronicles* seems to relate the original Words of God, or the Message in the very Words, and *Samuel* only in Substance. *God* did not deliver his Message *twice*, and therefore he said either *seven* or *three*; and the Relation of this Message in the two inspired Writers, varying *so much*, and in *so many Words* from each other, we must say that one of them took upon him to relate it his own Way, not regarding *Particulars*, but the *Substance* of it; relating it, not in the *very Words*, but according to the *Sense* and *Intent* of them; as it is usual to say, that a Person said so and so, when we repeat the *Meaning* of *what* he said in other Words. Mr. *Kennicott* concludes too fast therefore, that the Texts, as they stand, suppose that *Gad delivered his Message twice, or proposed both seven and three Years*, which it is not at all necessary to suppose; taking it for granted now, that this Message came upon the Back of the Famine for *Saul and his bloody House*, it was natural to call it a *seven Years Famine*, three more making it to continue so long. I must repeat it, because it is what

this Gentleman always forgets, and frequently makes an ill Use of the contrary Supposition, that the inspired Historians, when they say, a Person said so and so, do not mean *always* that he spoke in those very Words, or that he used no more Words than they do. *Gad*, undoubtedly, did not propose both *seven* and *three* Years; but the Writer of one History calls that *seven*, e. g. which the Prophet called *three*, as related by the other; the Reason of which, at present, we take to be that assigned above, 'till we are better informed. The main Difficulty, as the Objection is stated by our Author, is in accounting for the Prophet's proposing both a *three*, and a *seven Years* Famine, in one Message once delivered, which is a Mistake of the Gentleman's own making; the two Histories put together not requiring us to believe any such thing.

1 Chron. xxiv. 6.

“ Instead of *one Household* taken for *Eleazer*,
 “ and *one* for *Itbamer*, the present Hebrew
 “ Text [having קָרְבָּן Captus, instead of תָּחָנָן
 “ *Unus*] signifies—one taken for *Eleazer*, and
 “ taken TAKEN for *Itbamar*.” p. 514.

The Gentleman construes wrong, the present Hebrew Text says,

“ *one Household* קָרְבָּן taken, or given in Possession to *Eleazer*, and קָרְבָּן an Inheritance or
 “ *Household* קָרְבָּן given in Possession to *Itbamar*.”

So good a Critick must have seen this, had he not had a Turn to serve. And I may observe here again, that most of our Author's Objections are *Versional*, or founded on Mistranslations; and shew how ready he is to catch at a Fault, notwithstanding the mighty Zeal he pretends for the Text. קָרְבָּן like other radical Words is both *noun* and *participle*. And a *Possession given in possession*, or a *Lot allotted*, is a known *Hebraism*.

1 Kings iv. 26.

Solomon had forty thousand Stalls of Horses for his Chariots, and twelve thousand Horsemen.

2 Cbron. ix. 25.

Solomon had four thousand Stalls for Horses, and Chariots, and twelve thousand Horsemen.

There is a Corruption supposed here in the Number of the *Stalls*, there being a wide Difference betwixt 4000 and 40,000. The Text in *Kings* says,

“ Solomon had forty thousand Stalls of Horses
“ *למרכבו* for his Chariots, and twelve thousand Horsemen.”

Cchronicles, that he had,

“ four thousand Stalls for Horses; and [bad]
“ Chariots and twelve thousand Horsemen.”

It has been observed upon these Passages, that the forty thousand Stalls of Horses were for the Use of his twelve thousand Horsemen, as well as his Chariots—for his Chariots, and 12,000 Horsemen: Whereas the four thousand Stalls were for his Horses only, that were neither used by his Horse-soldiers, nor for his Chariots: And therefore there is no Contradiction here at all. It is plain that *Cchronicles* says, *be bad* 4000 Stalls of Horses, and Chariots, and Horsemen besides; unless you will suppose the Chariots and Men lay in Stalls too: So that one Passage is explanatory of the other, and the not attending to the different Wording of them, has led those who are too much prejudiced against the Integrity of the Text, to imagine a Fault in it here. Mr. Kennicott could not see this, plain as the Case is, and though it had been marked out to him; so thick is the Film of Prejudice,

P. 532.

1 Kings viii. 6.

“ 13 Words are omitted here, as is evident
“ from 2 Cb. vi. 4.” p. 475.

which is true enough: But the Question will be by whom? The sacred Historian or the Transcriber? Our Author seems to take it for granted that it was the Fault of the Scribe, I shall venture to say it *might* be the original Writer himself that omitted them; who was by no means obliged to copy Word for Word from another Author, or another from him, or to relate the same Story, Speech, Prayer, or, &c. with all the same Circumstances, or in the same Words: Neither Truth nor Exactness require it. If, in this Case, *Solomon* said what both the sacred Writers tell us he did say, neither of them can be deemed imperfect, because one gives us more than the other does. And by the same Rule we cannot argue, that the Writings of one have been imperfectly transcribed, for that Reason only. Were *Kings* a Transcript only of *Chronicles*, or *vice versa*, there would be some Force in this Reasoning—they vary from each other, therefore one must be corrupted: But as the Case is, it is only the Language of Prejudice and Prepossession.

1 Kings ix. 18. p. 474.

The celebrated *Tadmor* is supposed to be mispelt into *Tamor*, which

“ is evident from the Greek, Syriac, Arabic,
“ and *Chaldee* Versions; and particularly from
“ 2 *Chron.* viii. 4, where it is now תַּדְמָר
“ *Tadmor.*”

But these were two Cities. *Tamor*, see *Ezek. xlvi. 28*, in the Wilderness of *Kadesb*, near *Meribab*; and *Tadmor*, 2 *Chron. viii. 4*, near *Hamath*, upon the *Euphrates*; and 1 *Kings ix. 18*, describes *Tamar* (falsely writ in the Versions *Tadmor*) to be in the *Wilderness, in the Land*. In what Land? his own to be sure, the Land of *Judah*. And our Critick with all his Versions and MSS. must be mistaken here: *Baalatb*, another City built with *Tamor*, as mentioned here, was also in the Land of *Judah*;

see

see *Josh. xix. 8*, when *Pbaroab* took *Gezer* to the South of *Judah*, whereas *Tadmor* was to the East near *Hamath*, and built as a Defence against *Haderzer* by *Hamath*.

1 Kings ix. 23.

This Text compared with its supposed parallel Place, *2 Chron. viii. 10*, is said to read 550 for 250, p. 529.

A Corruption introduced through the Mistake of one numeral Letter for another.

Kings.

The Chief of the Officers that were over *Solomon's Work*, five hundred and fifty, which bare Rule over the People, that wrought in the Work.

Chronicles.

The Chief of King *Solomon's Officers*, two hundred and fifty that bare Rule over the People.

This is not the only Difference we meet with on this Head; for *1 Kings v. 16.*

— *Besides the chief of Solomon's Officers which were over the Work, three thousand and three hundred, which ruled over the Men that wrought in the Work.*

But *2 Chron. ii. 2.*

Solomon told out threescore and ten thousand Men to bear Burdens, and fourscore thousand to bew in the Mountain, and three thousand and six hundred to oversee them.

Differences these too great for the *accidental Change of a numeral Letter or two*, had there been any in the Text to change, or for the most blundering Transcriber to make without its being seen, by himself or somebody or other: And perhaps these Differences may explain and be vouchers for one another. Let us see,

Solomon

Solomon had 150,000 Labourers that were Strangers, and 3,600 *Israelites Overseers* over them, of which Number every twelfth Man was a *Cbief*; so we learn from 1 Kings v. 16, compared with 2 Chron. ii. 2, which tells us the whole Number of his Overseers over his Labourers was 3,600, whereas Kings tells us that the Number [*besides the Cbiefs*] of these Officers or Overseers was 3,300. Those Chiefs therefore were in Number 300. And as $12 + 300 = 3,600$, every twelfth Man was a *Cbief*, and the 300 commanded the Body of 3,600 who oversaw the 150,000 Labourers. But besides the Labourers there was a Body of 30,000 Men raised by a Levy out of all *Israel*, who by turns attended these Labourers as a Check, as well as a Guard over them, in case of Opposition from any Quarter from abroad, or Mutiny among themselves at home. And I suppose that the 250 *Cbiefs that bare Rule over the People*, were the *Cbiefs* of the Officers belonging to this Party, and chose out of those Officers by investing every twelfth Man of them, as before, with a superior Authority, As the Army was divided into Tens, Hundreds, and Thousands, every *tenth Man* having the command of the rest, the Officers of 30,000 must amount to 3000, which Number divided by 12 gives 250: And so we have got 300 Chiefs that belonged to the 3,600 Overseers, over the 150,000 Labourers; and 250 Chiefs that had the command over the Officers of the 30,000 *Israelites*, who were raised by a Levy out of all *Israel*, as Guards, and perhaps Purveyors also, for the Men employed in the great Buildings Solomon had in Hand. And these two Numbers put together give us the 550 mentioned, 1 Kings ix. 23, the Sum total of the Chiefs of the Officers, or Commanders of the Overseers over the People employed in his Work.

The three thousand six hundred Overseers, were each of them an *Officer* over a Party of the Labourers ; and every twelfth Man of themselves was invested with an Authority over the other Eleven, and consequently over the Men they supervised : And so it was with the 30,000, each twelfth *Officer* had here an Authority over the other Eleven. I suppose the twelfth Officer, rather than the *Tenth*, was invested with this Authority in Reference to the Number of the Tribes. The twelve Tribes furnished 2,500 Men a Piece, to make up the Levy of 30,000 ; and consequently the Number of Officers belonging to each Tribe was 250 : And as the 30,000 Men did Duty a Month at a time, by Turns, and rested two Months ; two hundred and fifty Officers having the Command of the Party on Duty a Month at a time, the Honour of the Command would be enjoyed equally by every Tribe ; and all the Officers would have their Turn to command once a Year. We know the Army was commanded by an Officer at the Head of every Ten ; ten times ten, and ten times ten times ten. But the Officers by every twelfth Officer, if it were not particular to this Occasion ; unless you will suppose that every ten of the Overseers, with the Body of Men under them, was doubly officered ; be that as it will, the Officers or Overseers over 150,000 Labourers were commanded by *Twelves*, and so the Officers over the 30,000 might be so too, and we have thence Reason to conclude they were ; it puts the Fact out of doubt, whatever the Reader may think of the Reason I have assigned for it ; and consequently the 250 belonged to them, which with the 300 Chiefs of the Overseers make up the 550 *Chiefs* in all over *Solomon's* Officers ; and the different Accounts when set together explain, and are Vouchers for one another. It is plain that the 250 did belong to the

30,000

50,000 *Israelites*, because here were but three Bodies of Men to be commanded, *viz.* 1st, The 150,000 Labourers, whose Officers are expressly said to be 3,600; and 2^{dly}, That Body of Officers or Overseers themselves, whose Chiefs or Supervisors, are by a plain Inference, as fully proved as express Words could have done it, to have been 300 in Number; and 3^{rdly}, The 30,000 who attended the Labourers by Turns, a Month at a time. Mr. Kennicott no doubt had compared, and considered the several different Numbers mentioned, and was fully convinced they could not comport, or be accounted for; or else he would never peremptorily, and without any Reason assigned, have condemned the Text as corrupted, and so I suspect that something may be objected to this Account of the Matter which I do not foresee.

<p>1 Kings ix. 28. Gold four hundred and twenty Talents.</p>	<p>2 Chron. viii. 18. Four hundred and fifty Talents of Gold.</p>
--	---

“ The 3 50 has been mistaken for its similar
“ Letter 3 20.” p. 529.

Various Solutions have been offered to account for this Difficulty, and untie a Knot, which it seems can only be undone by cutting, which every Child can do, if you put a Knife in its Hand. Some have supposed a Difference betwixt a royal and a common Talent; some a Difference betwixt *the neat produce* brought into the Treasury, and what was imported in the whole; part, *viz.* 30 Talents, being spent in Charges, or imported on private Accounts. Both which must make a Difference, if one Writer reckoned one way, and the other the other; which neither of them tells us, and so might, or might not, be the Case for ought we know. However it is not to be supposed that Solomon’s Ships made

made but *one single Voyage* to *Ophir* for Gold: And, therefore, they might at one time bring 450 Talents, and at another 420; these two being mentioned as Specimens of the great Quantity he imported thence at several Voyages. We are told he had six hundred and sixty-six Talents brought him in one Year; but not so much possibly every Year; and yet a great Quantity must come every Year to answer the immense Quantity he used in the Temple, his Houses, Furniture, and Armour. And *Ophir* was his best Supply, there coming from thence double the Number of Talents, for *several Years* at least, which there did from all other Places. And the two Texts are by no means contradictory to, but corroborative of, each other; the Trade of *Ophir* brought him in 450 Talents at one time, and 420 at another, and so on, sometimes more and sometimes less, but generally thereabouts. This seems to me to be the obvious and natural Meaning of the two Texts, and so is a natural Solution of the imaginary Contradiction—unless you will suppose that *Solomon's Fleet* made but *one Voyage* to *Ophir*.

1 Kings x. 11. is 2 Chron. ix. 10, writ אלמנים, אלגומים, as if the Letters were carelessly transposed. And it is not to be supposed, it seems, p. 475, that the Tree was called *Algum* and *Almug* both. However I shall suppose they did pronounce the Word both ways; and as it was a foreign Word see no Improbability in the Thing; but it is impossible to know which was the genuine Pronunciation; *Kings* writes it uniformly one way, *Chronicles* uniformly the other, which looks not like Accident but Design. What is commoner than for the vulgar Phrase to differ from the correct? And for People to conform a foreign Word to their own Pronunciation? Thus *Tiglath Pileser* is writ פל אסר, פל סר, and נסר.

1 Kings xi. 29.

שְׁלָמָה a Garment, is in some MSS. writ here, which latter Word is twenty-seven times used for a Garment, and the former sixteen times only, which induces our Author to suppose it a Mistake in those Places. And this he represents to be as clear a Case as if we were to meet with *Vestinemtum* instead of *Vestimentum* in some Latin Author; as if it were at all a parallel Case: Suppose I were to argue that *Vestis* was oftner used in some Author than *Vestimentum*, and therefore the long strange Word *Vestimentum* was certainly a *Corruption* in the Text; that would be nearly a parallel Case, and what I should expect to be laughed at for. The Hebrew Language is *ideal*, and its Words are Definitions of what they stand for. שְׁלָמָה is whole, entire, *integravit*, *perfecit*, Marius; so to *repay*, or make up the Sum that was broke; to *recomile*, or make up a Breach; *Peace*, *Acquaintance*, or those we are one or at *Peace* with. Job. ix. 31. *My Acquaintance nauseate me.* A Garment, either from its being whole and entire, without Seam, as their *Vestes-Talares* were, or from covering all over, a *Surtout*. I can find no Derivation of, it being only used as a Noun; and were it right to decide upon Conjecture only, I should conclude the reverse of what our Author does, that שְׁלָמָה was the truest Word, were there any Proof that one of them was not genuine.

1 Kings xii. 7.

וַיֹּאמֶר et dixit is properly וַיֹּאמֶר "et dixerunt in MSS. 2. 4." p. 476.

But in Hebrew, as in English, the plural Number is in the Noun or Pronoun, not the Verb; so said is both Singular and Plural; and it is not the Transcriber that has so notoriously mistaken Plurals for Singulars, and Singulars for Plurals; but our Author himself, who has so notoriously mistaken the Latin Grammar

Grammar for the Hebrew: Neither is there another Instance in this very Chapter, in

—Ver. 21. for בָּאָו' may be construed *they brought*.—Ver. 18.

“ Reboboam made speed to get up into his Chariot—and they brought Reboboam to Jerusalem; and he assembled all the House of Judah.”

So stand the Words, if you leave the Parenthesis out.

—Ver. 33, p. 477.

“ There is another extraordinary Mistake—
“ מלבד præter, instead of *ex corde suo*,
“ as it is in the Text of MS. 4. and Camb. 1.”

This extraordinary Mistake is in the Construction, not the Text; for מלבד is *solus*, by himself, or of himself, alone. בְּדַךְ *solus—cum litera ה adverbialiter usurpatur, solum, seorsum.* Mar. de Cal. Now,

“ the Month which he had devised alone, of
“ himself,”

is not bad Sense, nor a forced Construction, and comes to the same, as

“ the Month which he had devised out of his
“ own Heart.”

Numb. xxiii. 9. Deut. xxxii. 12, 33, 28. Jud. vii. 5. Psal. iv. 9; and other Places לְבַד is used without the Pronoun affixed, though it generally has one; and therefore מלבד is *ex solo sc. se, of himself alone, or alone, by regular Construction.* And our Author has been here, as on too many other Occasions, in too much Hurry to condemn the Text; and might have spared that Pertness he treats *Leusden* with, which I shall not cite; only say that מלבד is explained by מלבו, if it wants any Explanation. I am not without Hopes that the Author by this time blushes himself at that affected Contempt, and despicable Superiority he looks down upon

upon *Busdorf*, *Leusden*, and others with; Men who deserve well of the learned World, and are had in the Esteem of all good Criticks in Hebrew. I am quite a Stranger to the Gentleman, but cannot help conceiving him upon these Occasions in the Attitude of a little Country Pædagogue swag-
gering with the Rod over his Boys.

1 Kings xiii. 20, p. 477.

“ *It came to pass as they sat at Table—that the Word of the Lord came.*—The Arabic Version only has the Word here omitted, which reads—*as they sat a Table, and did eat.*”

I cite this Passage not that there is the least Diffi-
culty in the Case, or the least Evidence of an Omis-
sion, because *sitting at Table* certainly implies their
eating, if the Text had not told us of it afterwards; but as another Instance of the Author’s strong Pre-
judice against the Text, which he is resolved to ba-
stardize right or wrong.

2 Kings ix. 16, 21, 27, 29, and xv. 1. and 2 Cbron. xxi. 17, p. 490, we find אֲחִירָה and יְהוָאָרָה the Name of the same Person; the Word being writ sometimes one way and sometimes another, by Transposition, *not of Letters*, but of the Words that compose the Name, like that of *Amiel* and *Eliam* above, which makes no Alteration in the Sense; and if our *Nomination* were not entirely different from theirs, such things would not have the Appearance of an Objection. Our Names are arbitrary, theirs significant; and the Sense more than the Sound of the Word distinguished the Person the Name was given to. And if you leave out the י, it will be understood in אֲחִירָה or יְהוָאָרָה, *God a Possession*, sc. to him who bears the Name. And this is no more than is very common in other Cases; the *Pronouns* are often understood, very often in Names so compounded, as אֶלְעָה and בְּנֵיָה and בְּנֵיָה אֶמְרִיהוֹ and אֶמְרִיהָ. בְּרֵכִיהָ

דָּלִיאָ נְדָלִיהָו and נְדָלִיהָ. בְּרָכִיהָו and בְּרָכִיאָ
and *cum multis aliis*, which could never be *Blunderings*, as this Writer calls them, of the Transcribers, it being impossible their *Blunderings* should be regular in some Words, and not in others; and that they should *undesignedly* write the same Name three or four different Ways, without seeing their Mistake themselves, or being detected by others; and to vary the Name so far only as not to interfere with its *Meaning*, or the Rules of Grammar.

But there is a further Difficulty, for 2 *Chron.* xxii. 6, this King is also called עֹזֶר יְהוָה *bis Help be God*, and only in this one Place: And we have no Intimation of his Name being changed, or a new one given him by his Father, or assumed by himself, on any Application to God for Help. His Father was humbled by his severe Illness, and kept his Son, who reigned with him during his Sickness, within some Bounds; and possibly might, according to the Custom of those Times, give his Son this Name on a publick Humiliation and Intercession to God, for Aid and Assistance, who, his sore and incurable Diseases had now taught him, was only able to help. This is only Guess-work, only such Changes, Additions to old, and Impositions of new Names were then common upon such Occasions. The Text is silent as to the Reason. But his having another Name is no Proof of a Blunder here; nor is the Transposition of the Words that compose the Sentence his Name consists of, or the Omission of the י in other Places, any Proof of Blunderings there; such *Transpositions* and *Abbreviations* being customary and consistent with their *Nomination*.

The same Answer will suffice for,

2 *Kings* xiv. 21, and 2 *Chronicles* xxvi. 1. where the Son and Successor of *Amaziab* is called עֹזֶר יְהוָה ; עַזְיהָו ; עַזְיהָ ; עֹזְרֵי יְהוָה. the first, *God be*

his Help ; the second, *God be a Help* ; the third, *God be his Strength* ; and the last, *God be the Strength*, sc. of him who was so called. The Imposition of such a Name was saying as *Psal. xxi. 1, the King shall rejoice in thy Strength*, and with or without a *I* was the same Name ; which reduces the supposed *three* Names, see p. 480, [or rather the *four*, for if they are above two they are four] to two. And we have the same Reason to conclude he bore both these Names, as that he bore one of them ; and that the Names so *abbreviated* were looked upon as the same, as we now adays abbreviate many Names without being charged with *perplexedly varying the Name* of the same Person ; calling the same Person, *Henry* and *Harry*, *Edward* and *Ned*, *Malborough* and *Malbro'*, *St. Paul* and *Paul*, with many other such like Variations, which as they are commonly known breed no Confusion, and so no doubt, they had their known Variations, which led them into no Mistakes, and which the Text would teach us, if we did not take upon us to teach the Text what to say : And when our Author would parallel this with writing *Carpzovius*, sometimes *Capzorvius*, at other times *Carpzoviū*, and asks,

“ whether we should not *think* them, whether
 “ we would not *declare* we thought them, to
 “ be one and the same *Word* erroneously ex-
 “ preſſed : ”

He is only weakly endeavouring to mislead his Reader into, and confirming himself in, an Error, by a wrong State of the Case, because our Changes in Names are not directly similar to theirs ; yet we vary Names, nay change them to others, without any Danger of being charged with Blundering, unless some conceited Foreigner, who though ignorant of our Customs, should pretend to be extremely well versed in them ; and by judiciously conforming

ing them to his own, should puzzle himself, and plague his Reader, only to be thought somebody.

2 Kings xix. 23. בְּרַכְבָּ in the Text is very good Sense, בְּרַכְבָּ being the *Rulers* of his Charioteers, as Jer. xvii. 25, and xxiii. 4, those Rulers or Officers without their Men being, in their proud Boast, an Over-match for *Hezekiah* and his whole Army.

Nor need we be so surprised at the Omission of צְבָאת, in, —Ver. 31. see p. 481, because *Jeboab* very often occurs without it.

2 Kings xx. 4, p. 189. “Urbs is corrupted from חַצֵּר *Atrium.*” The Words are, *and it came to pass afore Isaiah was gone out into [Text] the middle of the City, [Marg.] the Middle-court.* And what is there to determine the Corruption upon the Text? Or that the Sense is not the same either way? Our Author only says, the Text is corrupted, gives no Proof.

—Ch. xxiii. 33. *Pharoab-Necbo put him in Bands* —בְּמֶלֶךְ because he reigned, or for reigning,

“ instead of which MS. 2. reads properly “מֶלֶךְ;” *ibid.*

but the Textual is in all Probability the right Reading, because *Jeboabaz* being the younger Brother had usurped the Throne, and without the Leave of *Pharoab*; and therefore *be put him in Bands* בְּמֶלֶךְ for reigning, or taken the Government upon him, and made *Eliakim* the elder Brother King in his Stead. בְּ is used in the same Sense, for, or because of, Verse 3, of the next Chapter.

The 25th of this Book of Kings, is parallel to Jer. lii. as to the Subject of them, and there are Variations, but not Corruptions; unless a Variation is a Corruption in one Writer or the other. As to the Observation, that *until the Day of his Death*, seems a most unnecessary Tautology, Jer lii. ult. I shall only say, it is pity the sacred Writer

had not had this learned Gentleman by him to have directed him how to express himself.

1 Chron. i. 36, p. 482.

There are many Corruptions it seems in this Chapter not worth mentioning, or not so evident as to pass undisputed, but in this Verse

“ there must be a Mistake.”

If there must, there must, but the Mistake is in our Author, and his *Arabic Version*, not the Text; see note on Gen. xxxvi. 16, for *Timmab* was the Name of the Son, as well as of the Mother; as *Abolibama* was likewise the Name of the Wife, and Son of *Esau*. The like Mistake the Author is fallen into in his next Instance in this Page, from

—Ch. ii. 18.

אֶת עַזְוָבָה וְאֶת יְרִיעָתָה בָּנָה &c. The Versions differ in the rendering of these Words, and seem to have mist the Sense of them. The Greek says, *Caleb took Gazubab to Wife and Jeriob.* The *Vulg.* that *Caleb took him a Wife named Azubab, by whom he had Jeriob.* The *English*, *Caleb begat Children of Azubab his Wife and of Jeriob.* But our Author says,

“ omitting the Words inserted [in the *English*]

“ it will be, and *Caleb begat Azubab Wife and*

“ *Jeriob.*”

By why *Azubab Wife*, and not *Azubab Ashe*? There is as much Reason for translating *Azubab* as *Ashe*. It is true that *Azubab* was the Name of *Caleb's* Wife, and might be so of his Son also; as *Epbratob* was of another of his Wives, and of his Grandson by her, as well as of the Place of their Abode also. Many Sons were named after their Mothers; and *Caleb* might name his eldest Son by *Azubab* after her, with the Addition of *Ashe*, which has other Significations besides that of Wife or Woman; and is part of the Name of several Men, if *Marius* be

be not mistaken. It may be hard to guess what they meant by it as a Name, and with what Propriety it might be made part of the Son's Name: But the Text, as it stands, says *Caleb begat Azubab, Ashe, and Jeriob*; and as I understand the next Words—*Ala, Benie, &c.* not, and these were ber Sons; for אלה and בניה were Family Names. The Words, these were ber Sons, [if they be rightly translated] and Azubab and Jeriob were his Wives, leave it undetermined which of the Wives the Sons belonged to; and if Jeriob were his Son by Azubab, are hardly Sense. *Caleb* signifies a Dog, and *Jeriob* Curtains; would not now a ridiculous Translation, that *the Dog begat the Curtains*, be as good a Proof of a Corruption in those Names, as Mr. Kennicott's *Azubab Wife* is that those Words are not right? I am no Critick, and don't know whether such low Shifts come within the Rules of sound *Criticism*, but they don't come within those of fair Reasoning.

1 Cbron. iv. 3. וְאֵלָה אָבִי עַיטָּב.

“ and these are Father of Etam, Jezreel, &c.

“ This is the true Version of the printed He-

“ brew, and if Words ever wanted Sense,

“ they do so here.” p. 483.

The Author's Words, but neither the Hebrew, nor our Translation, want Sense; though I do not think it hath construed the Hebrew right, I would make אלה a proper Name, and Ale the Father of Etam, Jezreel, &c. Etam was the Name of a Place, and so Ale, which they have render'd these, will be distinguished by being called Father, Head or Chief of the Place he belonged to, or rather which belonged to him, as so many others are, in the next Verse; Penuel the Father of Gedor; Ezer the Father of Husba; and Epbratab the Father of Betle-bem. And we have seen before, that very probably Ale was the Name of one of the Sons of Caleb; and

this 3d Verse contains the Genealogy of *Caleb* by his Wife *Azubab*; as the next does of some of his Descendants by another of his Wives; and as the next Verses do of *Ashur* the Son of *Hezron*, another Branch of this Family. But the Genealogies may administer so many Doubts and Disputes from mistaking appellative Words for *common*; and, *vice versa*, that he must love disputing, who enters this Field with any Pleasure.

I Chron. vi. 57. *And to the Sons of Aaron they gave Cities of Judah,* אֶחָת הַבָּרֶן — a mighty Quarrel is picked with the Text here, and

“ the Sense absolutely disallows the Word
“ *Judah*—also יְהֻדָּה has improperly been made
“ יְהֻדָּה.” p. 484.

and all this from not observing, through too much Haste to condemn the Text, that the Text doth not say,

“ Cities of Refuge in *Judah*, *Hebron*, and
“ *Libnab*;”
but “ Cities of *Judah*, the Refuge *Hebron*, and
“ *Libnab*,”

not giving himself time to see into the Meaning of what he makes such an Outcry about. See *Com.* p. 108. and *Mr. Kennicott*, p. 553. who fondly thinks he has clearly proved that *Judah* is an *Interpolation* here.

I Chron. viii. 29.

Our Author finding some Variations betwixt the Genealogy of *Benjamin* in this Chapter, and that Part of it which is repeated in the next, concludes, as usual, that this

“ repetition affords an unanswerable Argu-
“ ment against the Preservation of every He-
“ brew Letter.” p. 485.

But the Integrity of the Text doth not depend upon the Conformity of one Passage to another in every

every Letter, tho' they relate both to the same Subject.

In this Verse,

“ The Name of the Wife of some one, whose

“ Name is omitted, was Maacbab.”

No: her Husband's Name is not omitted. It was the Father of Gibeon. The Verse says,

“ And in Gibeon, יְשִׁבּוּ they dwelt with the

“ Father of Gibeon, the Name of whose Wife

“ was Maacbab.”

The Heads of the Fathers of the Tribe of Benjamin are reckoned up in the preceding Verses, and some of them said to have dwelt in Jerusalem, and some with the Father of Gibeon at Gibeon; he not being the only, though the principal Head of the Fathers that dwelt there. We have found out then the Husband of Maacbab, his Name not being omitted, as was supposed; unless the Author means that calling him Father of Gibeon is not mentioning his Name, for the Father of Gibeon's Name or Surname was Abiel, 1 Sam. xiv. 51. However, we have found her Husband out, which saves the Integrity of the Text. Next we find the Genealogy of Maacbab, that she was the Sister of Jebiel, of the Tribe of Judah, who, with 690 others of that Tribe, dwelt with the Benjaminites at Jerusalem, and their other Cities; as,

—Chap. ix. 35.

“ at Gibeon they dwelt with the Father of Gi-

“ beon [Jebiel his Sister's Name was Maac-

“ bab] and his first-born Son Abdon.”

See Ver. 6. Of the Sons of Zerab זָרָב, Jebiel, who with others of the Tribe of Judah, and of the chief Fathers of the Levites, dwelt at Gibeon, with the Father of Gibeon; and Jebiel is mentioned again in this 35th Verse for the sake of Maacbab his Sister, who was the Wife of the Father of Gibeon, and Mother of Abdon, and nine other Sons enum-

rated here. There seems no mighty Difficulty here, though the antient Versions have all thought it so, by altering the Text, and making it say, that *Maacbab* was the Wife instead of the Sister of *Je-biel*, and so making *Je-biel*, who was of the Tribe of *Judah*, the same with the Father of *Gibeon*, whose Surname was *Abiel*, and he a *Benjaminite*; and this is another Proof that the Authority of the Text is preferable to that of *all the Versions* put together. It is true that נָרָא is omitted *cb. viii. ver. 30.* and מְקֻלָּת ver. 31. but whether by the Transcriber or Historian, remains to be proved: the Omission of הַנָּה also in נְכַרְתָּה, will admit of the same Doubt, such Abbreviations being common.

— *Ver. 40.*

“ *מַרְיִי בָּעֵל מְרִיב בָּעֵל* and *Merib-baal*.
 “ What! *Meri-baal* and *Merib-baal*! are these
 “ again different Names of the same Man,
 “ and both expressed properly? *credat Carpzo-*
 “ *vius.*”

Yes; and both expressed properly, *et credat Kennicottus ipse*; it being a Rule in the Tongue, that in compound Words where one ends with the same Letter the other begins with, to drop one Letter. So if you pronounce this Name as two Words, for of two Words it consists, it will be properly *Merib-baal*; if as one Word, *Meribaal*. *Cb. viii. 34.* writes it as two Words, this Verse as one Word, after having writ it as two.

2 *Cron. xi. 18.*

“ we read that *Rebabobam* took him to Wife
 “ *Mabalath*, בָּנָה the Son of *Jerimoth*; and must
 “ this Nonsense too be ascribed to *Ezra*!”

p. 483.

No, the Versions and our Critick may take it to themselves, as well as the Nonsense they have made besides in this Verse. The Words are,

“ *Reba-*

“ *Reboboam took unto him ירימoth בנו* ”
 “ the Son of *David, Abibil the Daughth of Eliab* ”
 “ the Son of *Jesse* ; and she bare unto him Sons,
 “ &c.”

It is plain that there is but *one Woman* spoke of here, and the Versions, all of them, without the *unauuthorised Addition*, of *and*, are not Sense ; and they make *Jebush*, as well as his Brethren, be born of two Mothers ; בָּנָה must be the right Reading here, because it is not Sense otherwise ; and the Versions mistook מחלות for an *Appellative*, or they would never have altered מחלות, בָּנָה, into מחלות, בָּנָה signifies a *Relict*, whether by *Death* or *Divorce* ; a woman who has been known by Man : see the Use of חללה under חלל in *Marius*. The Name of this Princeſs *Reboboam* married was *Abibil* of the House of *Eliab*, the eldest Son of *Jesse* ; and she had been before this the Wife of a Son of *Jerimoth* a Son of *David*. Why she is so particularly described, doth not appear ; but it is plain that there is but one Person spoke of.—*He took unto him a Wife—and she bare, &c.* So that we have here a remarkable Instance of the Insufficiency of the Versions, and of the Authority of the Text.

The Author finds one or two *strange Mistakes* more in these Chapters, the Frequency of which throughout the Bible, is a Proof that they are only strange to us, being very familiar to them.

This Gentleman has a *strange Suspicion*, that
 “ the two laſt Verses of *Chronicles* have been
 “ added improperly,”

because *Cyrus’s Decree* is not repeated at large, as it is in *Ezra*, where the History of the *Jews* is continued. But had *Chronicles* mentioned the whole Decree of *Cyrus*, the same Suspicion might have been raised of an *improper Ending*, because it abruptly broke off without relating any thing of the Consequence of such an important Decree, or of the

Return

Return of the Jews; and such Suspicious can never have an End, or meet with reasonable Satisfaction, not being founded on Reason.—The sacred Writer went so far, why did he not go further?

Job. i. 10. הֲלֹא אַת שְׁפֵת בָּעֵד?

This is construed, *nonne tu posuisti sepem,* *Hast not thou made an Hedge about him?* which hath induced our Author to think that **תְּאַ** is a Corruption, and he informs us, p. 522. that in the *Eton Copy*, “the Word is regularly **אַתְּ**” and it should be so, if the Versions were slavishly *literal*, and you could find out what the original Words were by turning those Versions back again into *Hebrew*. But if **תְּאַ** be a Noun here, a Fence or Hedge, the **תְּאַ** will be regular as it stands. *Is there not a very Hedge about him?*

The **תְּ** in **תְּאַ** a Fence, is changed into **תְּ** by *Bybner Reg. 34.*

Job. xlvi. 2. I know that thou canst do every thing. p. 494.

This in the printed Text is, *thou knowest, &c.* *Job* speaking to God. Mr. Professor Chappelow hath surprised Mr. Kennicott with saying, that this makes the Expression more sublime:

And he replies,

“one should not have expected to find *Sublimity*, if *Sense*, ascribed to this Reading by any Man, who allows Mistakes in the printed Text—that this Author does is fully manifest from his offering Corrections, even though unsupported by any one *MS.* or *antient Version.* See particularly, *Ch. xix. 25.*”

The learned Professor’s *Job* has not fallen into my Hands, and therefore I know not what Liberties he has taken with the Text, but am sorry to hear he has taken any, particularly such as he is here charged with. It is much to be deplored, for the Sake of the unlearned and unstable, and for their own

own Sakes, as Christians, that Men of Sense and Learning should presume to lay violent Hands on the Ark of God, and strip its sacred Covering from it. MSS. may help to correct MSS. and improve this or that Edition ; but to correct *without the Authority of any one MS.* upon Conjecture only, is *doing Despight to the Word of God.* Job. xix. 25, contains a most glorious Confession of the Christian Faith, which no Corrections can add Beauty or Strength to.

“ I know that my Redeemer is Life, and
 “ that he shall *bereafter* arise in Dust. That
 “ by and by my Skin shall enclose him ; and
 “ I shall see him who *is the Curse* made of my
 “ Flesh ; whom I shall see like myself, and
 “ my Eyes shall behold him, for he is no
 “ *Stranger*,” one of another Nature, “ my
 “ Heart’s Desires shall be fulfilled.”

But to return, there is no *Sublimity* in *thou knowest*, &c. but if it is not more *sublime*, it is more *modest* and *humble* at least, and *respectful*, as it submits itself to the Person spoke to, and assents to the Question proposed upon his own Authority and Evidence—God puts the Question to Job, Ch. xl. 9. *Hast thou an Arm like God? or canst thou thunder with a Voice like him?* And then describes the Strength in several Creatures which he had given them, as Proofs of his own Power, to which Question Job answers, in the Phrase of those Times—*Thou knowest thou canst do every thing.* Art thou a King, says Pilate to our Lord, *Thou says it*, replies our Saviour; not *I say it*. So Job, answers, *thou knowest it*; not *I know it*. “ It is as you say; “ your own Word is sufficient without all these “ Proofs, that thou canst do all things.”—I will not dispute with Mr. Kennicott about the *Sublimity*, but the *Sense* and *Decency*, of this Answer, seems out of dispute.

Psal.

Psal. xvi. 10.

The Apostle cites Part of this Psalm, *Act. ii.* and applies it as predictive in a literal Sense, of the Resurrection of *Christ*; that *his Soul*, as we translate it, *was not left in Hell*, *neither his Flesh did see Corruption*, which is the Inference the Apostle draws from the four last Verses of this Psalm, cited by him, as they stand in the LXX Version; not as they are in the *Original*, which that Version varies in several Places from, as the *English* Reader may see by comparing the two Places; though the *English* is not an exact Translation.

Ver. 8. “ I have set the Lord always before
“ me,”

have had my Eyes always on God ;
“ therefore he is at my Right-hand, that I
“ should not be moved ; for this my Heart is
“ glad, and כבוד' my,”

not the *Tongue*, as is plain from its Seat among the Inwards or Entrails; but *Liver* perhaps, or *Kidneys*; some Part in the Belly, that *feels* the Motion of Joy, as the Heart does.

“ Liver rejoiceth ; my Flesh also shall rest
“ in Hope.”

Secure, quiet, and undisturbed ;
“ for thou wilt not leave my Body to the
“ Grave ; thou wilt not suffer thine *Holy Ones*
“ to see Corruption : Thou wilt make me to
“ know the Path of Life ; the Fulness of the
“ Joys of thy Presence, the Pleasures at thy
“ Right-hand for evermore.”

I have kept as near the *Original* as possible ; and it differs from the Citation by the Apostle in several Places ; particularly where it says, *thou wilt not suffer thine Holy Ones*, which in the Citation is *Holy One, to see Corruption*. Mr. Kennicott argues with great Vehemence from hence against the Integrity of the Text—p. 218, and 496.

“ It

“ It must be observed first—that the Words,
 “ God will not suffer his Saints to see Corruption
 “ are not true.”

If they are not true, neither are Christ's own Words true, Joh. viii. 51. *If a Man keep my Saying, he shall never see Death.* Ch. xi. 26. *Whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.* If these Words are true of *all the Saints*, the other may be so too; for they say no more nor less than they do. What is the Meaning, of *not seeing Corruption*? His ~~was~~ Hebrew, ~~ψυχή~~ Greek, animal Frame was not left in the Grave, neither did his *Flesh* see *Corruption*, says St. Peter. His Body was left there however till the third Day; and till that time his *Flesh* did see ~~the~~ Corruption, Destruction, or the Place of Corruption, for so the Hebrew signifies, and is used as a Noun for a Pit; as a Verb, to kill, destroy, throw down: The Meaning therefore must be, that his Body should not be deserted in the Grave, neither should his *Flesh* see Death triumphant over it. And the precise Time he was to lay in the Grave is not mentioned, and the Circumstance of his Body not suffering a Dissolution, is implied, not expressed. The Law in a Number of its Ceremonies prophesied that Christ should rise again the third Day, as did many of the *secondary* Prophesies. This Psalm no doubt of it does predict the Resurrection of *some one particular Person*, whose *Flesh* was to rest in Security, was not to see Destruction, nor be deserted in the Grave; which had Christ suffered a Dissolution there, and lain in the Grave as David does, had not been true of him. And it is evident from the Words, if literally translated, that they must mean so much—and something further—that God's Mercy should finally extend to *all his Saints*, as well as to *one particular Person*; meaning Christ. And this Prophesy, like all the rest concerns Christ in the first and principal Place, and *all the Holy Ones*

in a lower Degree. The Psalm begins with a Dialogue—

“ Preserve me O God, for in thee do I put
“ my Trust.

“ Thou say’st to *Jehovah*, thou art my Lord.”
i. e. *Jehovah* will be thy Lord, or thy Support,
as thou saith, thou faith it, it is so.

“ My Goodness is not for thee ;”
sc. only.

“ It is for the Saints that are in the Earth,
“ and the Excellent ; in them is my Delight.”
Christ speaks and is answered ; he calls on God as
in great Distress ; he is assured of Mercy, because
he always depends upon him. Christ is the Head,
the Saints are his mystical Body ; the Blessings on
Christ rest not on him only, all that are holy, and ex-
cell in Righteousness are to be Partakers with him ;
inter al. *he died and rose again for our justification*,
as the first Fruits of them that sleep. Some Cir-
cumstances were peculiar to our Lord’s Resurrec-
tion. His Flesh was to rest undisturbed, and his
Body raised the third Day, before it could suffer a
Dissolution, or see Corruption. But all that is said
here will not be completed till the Resurrection
of the Just. Their Flesh may be said now to rest
in Hope ; and when they are raised incorruptible, it
will in a qualified Sense be true, that God did not
suffer them to see Corruption, in our Lord’s Words
to see Death, triumphant, and absolutely victori-
ous. It was generally known, at that time of Day,
that the *Messiah* was the Sum and Scope of all the
Prophesies, and they knew that he was intended
here. They knew the Just were to be raised in-
corruptible, though they had applied in their Trans-
lation, what is said of all *Saints*, in this Clause, to
one Person only ; because one only was in the stricter
Sense not to see Corruption ; but it is decreed with
regard

regard to all the Saints, that they are not to see Death.—

The Words then I hope are true, as they stand: But says our Author,

“ if they were, they would not predict the Resurrection of any particular Person.”

No, by themselves, they would not perhaps. The Apostle doth not apply them by themselves, but in Conjunction with others which do speak of one Person only, as *my Flesh, &c. my Body, &c.*

“ What shall we say then? Have the Apostles imposed a Prophesy upon the Jewish People, and upon the World?”

No, they only apply a Prophesy to *Christ*, as it stood in their Translation, and in the Septe they understood it, which being conform to the general Scope and Meaning of the Psalm, they have not imposed upon any Body.

“ But I would ask—was this Noun Plural in the Days of the Apostles, or was it not?”

“ If it was, the Apostles have misquoted it.—”

No, they do not quote it at all; they only quote the received Translation, for wise Reasons, as it stood, without entering into grammatical Disputes, or taking upon them to new construe the Bible to those they argued with: And they have done so in many other Instances, where the Translation is not, nor ever was according to the Original: Every Child knows this; and let him who disputes it read over our Translators Preface to the Bible—or compare almost any two Chapters together. And therefore all this ado to prove יְהִוָּה a Corruption from Apostolical Authority, is entirely besides the Question; and the Authority of the Apostles of as little Use to the Gentleman, as the Lion's Skin to the Ass in the Fable.

There is a peculiar Beauty in the *textual Reading* here, besides a plain literal Promise to true Believers

lievers of being raised to Immortality. The Speaker strengthens his own Hopes of a Resurrection, and that soon after his Death, from the general Promise of Life Eternal to all Saints.—*I know that my Flesh will rest secure, and my Body be raised from the Grave uncorrupted, because God will not suffer his Saints to see Corruption*, sc. triumphant; and the Reason and Propriety of the Inference goes upon the same Ground St. Paul argues on, *1 Cor. xv. 13, viz.* the necessary Connection betwixt the Resurrection of the Dead, and that of the *Messiah*—*if the Dead rise not, then is Christ not raised.* David speaks before-hand the Thoughts of *Christ*, and his Reasoning about the Promises of God to him; and he infers his own Incorruption from the Triumph the Saints are to have over Corruption. And so St. Peter reasons very justly upon this Passage, that *Christ* was so soon to be raised, as that he could not be said to have seen Corruption, because all were to arrive at a Time when Corruption should not be to be seen; which had *Christ's* Body lain rotting in the Grave, they could never have done, *for in Christ shall all be made alive.* And they are said to be already risen with him, it being certain that they will arise through him: But as we infer the Certainty of our Resurrection from that of our Lord's; so he himself when on Earth, and the dreadful Scene approached of his Sufferings, Death, and the Grave, comforts himself because God had promised not to desert others, and those others which he could not save but through him. There was something highly rational in this Inference, as well as convincing and comfortable to the Mind of our great Bondsman, when he was almost sinking under the Weight of the Scorn, Contempt, and Triumph of his Enemies—God will not desert his Saints, therefore cannot desert me—*the Steps of the good Man are ordered by the Lord—though he fall he shall*

not be utterly cast down—for the Lord loveth Judgment, and forsaketh not his Saints, Psalm xxxvii. This is the Reasoning of Christ in many Psalms; but it is not to be maintained from this Passage alone, supposing the marginal Reading, *thou wilt not suffer thy Holy One to see Corruption*, to be the true Reading, that his Body was *not to rot or dissolve* in the Grave, for חזה no more signifies *rotting*, than *killing* and *burying*, does in English, as is plain from the Usage of the Word, and so *Marius, Leigh*, and others construe it. And our Lord's Body was laid in חזה the Place of Corruption, or Dissolution, as much as any other Person's; and so in one Sense *saw it*: But his Body being raised *entire* [except the Wounds in his Side, Hands, and Feet, and the Blood and Water that were shed on the Cross,] he saw not Corruption, not as we say to a Mathematical Exactness, but to all Intents and Purposes.

This is a very important Point, and not the Integrity of the Text only, but the Sense of Scripture is concerned in the Dispute, which would deprave the Text, and twist a most beautiful Passage to a Sense not to be defended: And there is a strong Argument in favour of the textual Reading here, that they have let it stand against *all the antient Versions*; which they would not have done had they had any authentic MSS. to correct it upon.

The Authority of the *Masorets themselves*, though Mr. Kennicott seems to think otherwise, is on the Side of the Text here, because they did not alter it, though by their *marginal Correction* they did not understand it.

Psalm xxii. 17, ורגלי, p. 499.

This is explained in a Note on this Psalm *Data*, part 2.

“ The Dogs have compassed me, the Assembly of the Wicked: *They have coiled me as they do a Lion by the Hands and the Feet.*”

The Words allude to the Manner of catching the wild Beasts by their Feet; a Custom in use to this Day, by Pits or Nets, in which their Feet are hampered. *Job. xix. 6. bath חקיף his Net round me.* *Psal. xxv. 15. He taketh my Feet out of the Net.* *Lam. i. 13. A Net for my Feet.* *iv. 20. The anointed of the Lord was taken in their Pits.* This Passage has indeed perplexed the Learned, and the Defenders of the Text have made but a bad Figure here: But when the natural and obvious Meaning of the Words is attended to, there will be no doubt of the Textual being the true Reading; that Circumstance of the Crucifixion by the Hands and the Feet being so beautifully couched under this Metaphor. I shall only say farther, that though **כארו** may be found in some MSS. instead of **כארי**, that it is not to be found in Hebrew, there being no *Verb* it can be derived from, and is only a Proof that some Transcribers, or Correctors of Copies had the Presumption formerly which prevails so much now, of altering what they did not understand; and have left an indelible Mark of their own Ignorance by it.

Psal. xxv. 17.

This Psalm is supposed *Alphabetical*, as the 145th is likewise; and

“ the Verse beginning with the Letter **כ** is omitted.” p. 501.

And so is the second, for there is none that begins with **ב**, nor is there one that begins with a **ג**; the last Word indeed of the 5th has a **ג** in it, which by *poetica licentia* may do as well. The Division into Verses is arbitrary, and such Observations too imaginary to found Rules to condemn the Text upon.

Psal. lix. 6.

וְאַתָּה יְהוָה אֱלֹהִים צְבָאות אֱלֹהִי יִשְׂרָאֵל.
“ In

אלהים " In this Verse we find the Word אלהים

" twice in a *construct State.*" ibid.

Perhaps not; Aleim may be in *Apposition*, as *Jebo-vah* is, with צבאות. And besides, though it is a Rule to drop the *Plural* ס in *Regimine*, yet it is by no means an invariable Rule, as any one must have observed, who is acquainted with the Text.

—“ in Ver. 11, MS. 2. reads properly ;” חסיד “ but חסיד is as good Sense—*My God, his Mercy shall prevent me*, which is the same as, *my God's Mercy shall prevent me*.

Psal. lxviii. 9, p. 502.

The Author makes an Alteration here from not understanding the Text, as I humbly apprehend he does not; and is led into it by a strange Way he has got of *paralleling* this or that Passage, which perhaps have no Relation to each other; and then from another mistaken Notion that all parallel Places must be worded alike, arbitrarily supposes one of them wrong, and then rectifies it *with a most finished Propriety* from the other. This Passage is paralleled with *Jud. v. 4, 5*, and a Defect supposed in the Psalm.

“ The Word *bis Sinai* stand here so unconnected, that there seems to be some Mistake,” or Mistconstruction. Sinai stands just as much connected with the Earthquake and Storms of Heaven here in the Description, as it did at the time the great Scene was acted, which is here spoke of. The Earth, on which *Sinai* stood, trembled, and *Sinai* of course with it: The Heavens poured down Rain, Thunder, and Lightning, from the Top of *Sinai*, and so *Sinai* dropped as well as the Heavens; and the *Verbs* are as applicable to one as the other.

“ The Earth shook, the Heavens also dropped at the Presence of God: *Sinai* itself, at the Presence of God, the God of *Israel.*”

i. e. Sinai trembled, and dropped. Deborah mentions the Mountains, the Heathens Churches, trembling before the God of Israel, as well as Sinai, because those Mountains were to be removed, as well as Sinai; David is not speaking of those Mountains, but of the Law, Sinai, giving way to Christianity. Sinai was now to melt, and the new Heaven and new Earth were now to commence; the Mountain of the House of Israel being to be removed and cast into the Sea, at the time this Psalm speaks of.

כִּי אָכַל אֶת יְעָקֹב וְאֶת נָחוֹר הַשְׁמָוֹן
 Psal. lxxix. 7, p. 504. *וְאֶת נָחוֹר* is supposed to be corrupted here, because the nominative Case is plural; and

“ especially as both Verbs here are regularly plural in all the ancient Versions;” which is no Proof that both Verbs had the **ל** in Hebrew, as has been often observed: And to make all over sure,

“ if any Doubt can possibly remain, let us receive the Testimony of Jeremiah, in Chap. x. 25.”

where the Verb is both singular and plural, though referring to the same nominative Case, and so the Testimony of Jeremiah overthrows what it was brought to support. But as the Passage in Jeremiah is similar to that in the Psalms, therefore parallel, therefore originally the same, without all dispute—Jeremiah will discover two Corruptions in the Psalm, and the Psalm some in Jeremiah,

“ and both be equally improved by a Comparison.”

Pour out thy Wrath upon the Heathen that have not known thee, and

Pour out thy Fury upon the Heathen that know thee not; and upon

and upon the *Kingdoms* that have not called upon thy Name; for **אכלו** they have devoured *Jacob*, and **השמדו** laid waste his dwelling Place.

upon the *Families* that call not upon thy Name; for **אכלו** they have eaten up *Jacob*, **וأكلתו** and devoured *him*, **ויכלתו** and consumed *him*, and made his *Habitation* desolate.

Here are three Variations which the Author makes four of, and confounds *1st*, *2d*, and *3d*, that it is hard to guess what he means:

“ The *1st* Variation is evidently in favour of “ *Jeremiah*;” meaning, I apprehend, that of **אכלו**, which is the *2d*.

“ The *2d* seems to be in favour of the Psalm, “ as **משפחות** is not countenanced by the— “ Versions.”

This is the first Variation, and why *Families* is not as good a Word as *Kingdoms* here, would be hard to tell; they are used as synonymous frequently. *Kingdoms* at first were but *Families* in the restrained Sense of the Word; but that *Family* and *Kingdom* are equally proper in this Place; see *Gen. x. 5.* *1 Cbron. vi. 28.* *Jer. xxv. 9.* *Ezek. xx. 32.* *Am. iii. 1, 2.* “ *Against the whole Family which I brought up from the Land of Egypt; you only have I known of all the Families of the Earth: And the Versions might without any great Offence translate it, Family, Kingdom, Nation, or People.*

“ The *3d* Variation finishes the Proof of a “ Corruption in the Psalm.”

The *3d* Variation here is, if I tell right what he calls *the 4th and greatest, the Addition of two Verbs in Jeremiah, neither of which are in the Psalm,* which do indeed *finish the Proof of a Corruption in the Psalm, as they put an end to the Doubt about*

it, being both of them *singular*, as the condemned Verb in the Psalm is ; unless they are Interlopers themselves, which our Author hesitates about ; first passes Sentence with *a perhaps*,

" perhaps they are both added by Transcribers.—

" bers, —

immediately repreives one of them;

“ but most probably וַיְכַלְהוּ is a true and original Word;”

but finally condemns the other,

“ as **וְאָכַלְתָּה** makes the Sentence absurd ; ”

and being something like ייכלהו in Shape, was placed here by a Blunder of the Scribe, *who finding his Mistake was resolved to be in the right by persisting in his Error*; for this is the plain Meaning of what the Gentleman says here, as on many other Occasions,

“ we may therefore conclude, that וְאֶכְלָהוּ is a Var. Reading of וַיְכְלָהוּ [occasioned by אֶכְל just before it] and inserted by a Transcriber, who, resolved to have the true Reading, inserted both.”

Were not the Weakness of this Reasoning an Antidote to the Poison of it, and the Vanity of the Author did not afford some Diversion, it would raise one's Gall to see the Work, even of a common Writer treated with so much Lightness. What are we to say then, when we consider it as the Work of the Holy Spirit?

The Charge against וְאֶכְלָהוּ is, that it makes the Sentence absurd; merely because it is an emphatical Repetition, though not necessary to the Sense.

“ They have devoured Jacob ; yea they have
“ devoured him, and consumed him. and

Suppose now that the Prophet had his Eye upon those Words of the Psalmist, *they have devoured Jacob, and laid waste his dwelling Place*; with what Propriety

Propriety might he add to it, in his Time—yea
they have devoured Jacob, and consumed him.

If there be any thing absurd in this, I must submit to the Censure of patronising it: If there be not, I shall apply the Author's Words to himself, that

“ Zeal without Knowledge has operated very
“ extensively.

Psal. cx. 4; see Note on Gen. xxxi. 39.

Prov. v. 15, 16.

Drink Waters out of thine own Cistern; and running Waters out of thine own Well. Let thy Fountains be dispersed abroad, and Rivers of Waters in the Streets. Let them be only thine own, and not Strangers with thee.

The Translation in the 16th Verse is not very exact, or the Words the most proper that might have been chosen to express the flowing of a Fountain, or the spreading of the Stream from a Spring; but will do pretty well.

—“ Drink Waters out of thine own Cistern.”

To beg I am ashamed: There is nothing better for a Man than that he should eat and drink, and that he should make his Soul enjoy good in his Labour. Thou shalt eat the Labour of thine Hands. Labour for the Meat which endureth unto everlasting Life. Work out your own Salvation. The Foolish said unto the Wise, give us of your Oil. Have Salt in yourselves.

—“ Let thy Fountains be dispersed abroad.”

He that believeth on me, as the Scripture has said, out of his Belly shall flow Rivers of living Water; but this spake he of the Spirit. And no doubt Solomon speaks of the Fountain of living Water, that People should stir up the Gift that is in them; should not quench the Spirit, but let their Light shine before Men; should keep the Fountain out of which are the Issues of Life and Death, clean and open, that its Streams may run freely, and spread themselves in all broad Places (translated

Streets) as Rivers of Waters naturally do, if not choaked up, and which if they have not room to do, they stagnate and stink.

—“ Let them be only thine own, and not Strangers with thee.”

The Foolish said give us of your Oil; but the Wise answered saying, not so, lest there be not enough for us and for you.—Lest thou give thine Honour unto others, and thy Years unto the Cruel; lest Strangers be filled with thy Wealth, and thy Labours be in the House of a Stranger, Ver. 9, 10. What is there obscure in the two Verses above; or what Correction do they stand in need of? The Metaphor in them is the common Metaphor of Scripture, and the Advice that which runs through the whole sacred Writings; and one would think the Language was plain, and the Advice good, but the ingenious Mr. Kehnicott is wiser than Solomon, and he says, *let not thy Fountain flow.*

“ I presume that the judicious Reader will see
“ the Necessity of the Negation in the 16th
“ Verse; and allow that it was originally in
“ the Text.” p. 551.

And by this Comment at the Top of the Page, insinuates a Comparison as intended here, that is filthy and offensive; the Fountain must be dirty that sends forth such a muddy Stream.

Prov. x. 10.

“ He that winketh with the Eye, shall
“ give,”
shall give as a Tree its Fruit, or breed to himself,
as well as others,

“ sorrow; and a prating Fool shall fall;”
or one Evil in his Lips shall fall: But says Mr. Kencott,

“ what Contrariety or Connection is there be-
tween the two preceding Hemisticks?”

p. 506.

And

And this Question is to introduce a Correction of the Text thus—[according to the *Versions*]

“ He that winketh with the Eye, causeth Sor-

row ; but he that freely reproveth, worketh

“ Safety.”

A Construction and Alteration which shew that the *Versions* did not understand the Text. *Winking with the Eye* is not *conniving at a Fault*, as they took it, by the opposite of *freely reproving* ; but *contriving Wickedness*, and privately *counselling it*. *Cb. vi. 13. He winketh with his Eyes, he speaketh with his Feet, Frowardness is in his Heart.* *xvi. 30. עצח עיניו רץ שפחו annuens labiis suis, he bringeth Evil to pass.* We may see here that “*winking with the Eye* is not *conniving*, but *contriving* ; and that the *Lips* and *Eyes* have a very close Connection in *devising* and *counselling Evil* ; and that the proposed Emendation of *Solomon* is but correcting the *Magnificat*. Either this Gentleman, or myself, are very unhappy in our Interpretation of Scripture ; for I think there is scarce a Text cited by him and *explained*, where I am happy enough to see the Propriety of the Comment. The next Verse which is cited, as containing the same Advice with this, seems to me to mean a quite different Thing.

“ The Mouth of the Righteous is a Well of

“ Life, but the Mouth of the Wicked con-

“ cealeth Destruction.”

The Mouth of the Wicked concealeth Destruction, not by an unfriendly Silence at the Sight of a Fault, but *covers it*, as a Snare is covered, *with the Lips*, as the Word is used in the next Verse—*Love covereth over all Faults.*—*In the Lips of him that has Understanding, Wisdom is found.*—*Ver. 13. The Wise hide Knowledge, sc. in their Mouth or Lips, lay it up as a Treasure—But the Mouth of the Foolish*

מִתְחַנֵּת

מְחַתָּה קָרְבָּה present Destruction: So the Wicked, the Foolish, *lay up, bide, cover, conceal, Violence and Destruction*, in their Lips. If the Gentleman had understood the Text in dispute; I fancy he would not have pronounced the Maxims in it,

“ absolutely inconnectible in their Nature;” for there is a close Connection betwixt the Lips and Eyes in speaking, counselling, and promoting good or bad Things. This same Hemistick is found also Ver. 8th, and that with great Propriety, since שְׁפָתִים the Lips, is Confession, or Religion; and the Meaning of the 8th Verse will be.

“ The wise in Heart חַכָּם shall receive [the Fruit or Benefit of] the Commandments; “ but he that is foolish in his Lips, [corrupted in his Sentiments of Religion, or plays the Fool with them] shall fall.”

Prov. xi. 16.

“ A gracious Woman retainest Honour; and strong Men retain Riches.”

The Versions here again have mistaken the Meaning of the most obvious Words, and misled our Author into the Notion of the Omission of a Couple of Hemisticks. The Text means, as I apprehend, *a gracious Woman shall as certainly retain, or rather obtain, Honour, as מְרַגְּלָה those sent forth in War to lay waste and spoil a Country, do Riches.*

Prov. xix. 1.

“ Better is a poor Man that walketh in his Integrity, than he that is perverse in his Lips, and is a Fool.”

Mr. Kennicott doth not approve of this, as it stands.

“ —is there the least Antithesis between a poor Man and a Fool?—the Syriac Version has compleatly preserved this whole Verse, reading instead of a Fool, a rich Man; and instead

כִּיל—“ instead of in his Lips, in his Ways
 “ *stultus* destroys the Sense.”
הַל destroys all Sense. **כִּסְל** Marius, *fiducia, expectatio*. Leigh, *confident Hope* in their own Conceit. A *confident Fool* is the Reverse of the poor humble Man; and walking uprightly of being perverse; see Job, ix. 20. Prov. vi. 12, &c. Here is the *Antithesis* demanded, and the Text Sense as it stands. And what Title they deserve who have the *Confidence* to take such barefaced Liberties with the sacred Text bespeaks itself.

הַרְבִּית הַנוּ לְאֶנְדָּלָת הַשְׁמָחָה שָׁמָחוּ
 Isai. ix. 3. in our Translation,

“ Thou has multiplied the Nation, and not
 “ increased the Joy; they joy before thee.—”
 And says Mr. Kennicott, p. 541.
 “ —the Sentence could not stand thus origi-
 “ nally: The Word **לֹא** *non* should certainly
 “ be **לִי** *ei*—thou *bast* multiplied the Nation;
 “ thou *bast* increased the Joy thereof: They joy
 “ before thee.”

This is barely Sense, or consistent with itself, which the *English* is not: But then what Nation is spoke of? not the *Jewish*, for it is *Galilee of the Gentiles*, the Text points to. And besides, *thou bast multiplied the Nation*, to it *thou bast increased Joy*, is an unusual Position of Words; the Pronoun should have been post-fixed to **הַשְׁמָחָה**. It is pretty evident that the Prophet is speaking of *Christ* the great Light shining upon the *Gentiles*; preaching upon *Jordan* in *Galilee of the Gentiles*. So the Text relates to the Calling of the *Gentiles*, that God would make them his Children which were not so. **רֹב** is the Dignity or Preference given to the First-born, and **נֶדֶל** often used to bringing up of Children. Then literally,

“ Thou givest the Birth-right to a People
 “ thou didst not bring up. They rejoice
 “ with

“ with Joy before thee; according to the Joy
“ of Harvest; as Men rejoice when they di-
“ vide the Spoil. *Thou breakest the Yoke of*
“ *his Burthen, &c.*” as it was predicted to
Esau.

The *Masorets*, though they did not, or would not, understand the Text, yet were not *absurd* in determining in *Favour of נַחַת*, which is *certainly the right Reading*; and I will venture to pronounce it with the magisterial Air so peculiar to our Author. The judicious *Mede*, as cited p. 542, is in the right of it, *the Devil did certainly owe this Prophecy a Spight from the Beginning*; and that *Christians cannot be altogether excused for following the Jews so closely as to darken and confound the noble and clear Evidence it contains of our Restoration to the Birth-right*: But in adhering to the Text we follow not the *Jews*, but the Word of God.

Isai. xxxvii. 18.

“ Truly, O Jebovab, the Kings of *Affyria*
“ have laid waste all the *Lands and their Land*.
“ Can we doubt of a Mistake here?” p. 510.

Had he translated it, *all Countries, and their Ground*, and recollecting that God cursed the *very Ground*, and changed the *Nature of the Soil*, for the *Wickedness of the People*, as *Ps. cvii. 34. He turneth a fruitful Land into Barrenness, for the Wickedness of them that dwell therein*, no great *Absurdity* would have appeared here; for many of those Countries are standing *Evidence to this Day*, of the *Truth of it*. That *ארצות* is *Countries*, and *ארץ* the *Earth or Ground*, I need not prove; nor say any thing more to shew how *injudicious* the several *Emendations* are, the Author proposes. *ארצות* need not be altered into *נוּמָה*, for the Words mean the same thing; nor *ארץ* into *ארצחות*, because it makes *nonsense*; or at least loseth the *true Sense of the whole Passage*. In some of the *Places*, our Author

thor makes so free with under the Title of *criticizing* upon them, there is some Difficulty; but here all is plain: And, but for the most inveterate Prejudice against the Text, he must have seen it. I hope this, and some other Instances, will make him ashamed of setting up his own Skill in the Text, as the Measure of the *Integrity* of it; see Mar. de Cal. יְהוָה—*ipsos unius regionis incolas aut patriæ unius cives.* Item, *agrum in Terra.*

Isai. lxi. 1.

“ The Spirit of the Lord *Jebovab* is upon
“ me.”

This is cited by St. Luke iv. 18. *The Spirit of the Lord is upon me;* and either *Adoni* or *Jebovab* must be omitted: Our Critick concludes for *Adoni*, and calls it,

“ Demonstration from the New-testament of
“ the Insertion of אָדָנִי.”

Any thing is Demonstration when we have a mind to have it so. If you could conclude from the Citation, that one of the Words was inserted, it doth not determine which; and it will not be Demonstration of the Insertion of either of them, till there be some sort of Proof that our Lord, or the Apostles, were obliged to cite, or have cited, every Word in every Passage, they quote.

Jer. vii. 22.

“ This and the preceding Verse seem greatly
“ corrupted.” p. 512.

We are not told wherein, and so we can only guess: But I will cite them, and endeavour to shew that they are very good Sense as they stand. The Prophet is denouncing the Vengeance of God against the People of the *Jews* for burning Incense unto *Baal*, and walking after other false Gods, and all the Immoralities introduced by Idolatry.

Ver.

Verse 2. Stand in the Gate of the Lord's House—

“ and say, hear the Word of the Lord all ye of Judah, that enter in by these Gates to worship the Lord.—Will ye steal, murder, and commit Adultery—and come and stand before me in this House.—Therefore, thus says the Lord *Jehovab*; Behold mine Anger, and my Fury, shall be poured out upon this Place.—Thus says the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, *סִפְנָה* put an end to your Burnt-offerings *לְי* with your Sacrifices, and eat Flesh, without any Regard to its being consecrated as a Sacrifice, but as common Meat:

Verse 22.

“ For I spake not to your Fathers—על רֶבֶר “ for the Sake of [or, upon the Account of] Burnt-offerings and Sacrifice. But this thing I commanded them, saying, obey my Voice.”

I ordered not Sacrifice for its own Sake, but as a Lesson of Obedience: But they bearken not, nor incline their Ear, therefore I will accept of their Sacrifice no more: It is common Flesh unto me.

This seems the Drift of the Chapter, and Sense of the two corrupted Verses, which contain a Doctrine, expressed in very plain Words of infinite Consequence. That their Ceremonies were to have taught them Obedience, that being what God appointed them for; but since they no longer obeyed the Voice, or Intent of God in them, he would no longer bear with their Ceremonies, but put an End to them. And the Curse lies upon the Nation of the Jews to this Day, for not considering what their Ceremonies were, and what particular Lessons they were to teach them: Nay, even many Christians to this Day suppose the antient Jews looked on their Ceremonies

Ceremonies in the same Light the modern Ones do ; as Things ordered for their own Sakes, not as Lessons of Instructions to teach them the Meaning of what God said to them, when he bid them *obey his Voice*. It is the Mis-construction of סְפָר which I apprehend is the *Corruption* complained of by our Author, which as translated is not very good Sense.

The Variation of **הוֹצִיא** for **בָּאָתִים** in some MSS. is not materially different in Sense ; for “ in the Day they were brought forth,” is the same Sense as, “ in the Day of my bringing them forth.”

Cb. x. 7.

“ Among all the wise Men of the Nations, and in all their Kingdoms ;” but says Mr. Kennicott, “ the Phrase, *Kingdoms of the Wise*, is perhaps improper.” p. 512.

It is said that Solomon exceeded all the Kingdoms of the Earth for *Riches*, and for *Wisdom* ; so the *Kingdoms of the Wise*, may not be an improper Phrase, since the Kings affected to be called *wise Men* : But if they refer to *Nations*—[*Kingdoms of the Nations*] this Impropriety in the Phrase would only be an Oversight of our Author, who *corrects* as usual, because he doth not see the Meaning.

Cb. xii. 4.

Here the Author preposterously supposes the textual Word **אחריתנו** wrong, because the LXX have mistook it. He should have concluded likewise that **אללה** or **אל** is dropt, because the LXX have put in **օς**.

Cb. xv. 18.

“ MS. 2.—reads **הִיּוֹת** **הִיּוֹת** instead of that odd Division.” It is no odd Division. It is regular Grammar, as Gen. xviii. 18. *Abraham* **הִיּוֹת** **הִיּוֹת** being shall be, i. e. *shall surely be* ; so here,

“ why

“ why is my Pain perpetual ? and my Wound
 desperate that refuseth to be healed ?
 “ Thou art altogether unto me like deceitful
 “ Waters that cannot be trusted,”

that deceive the Expectation in the hottest Weather,
 when most wanted. It is *Sion* expostulating with
 God, and complaining in the Bitterness of her Di-
 stress.

Ch. xx. 11.

“ אָוֹתִי me in the printed Editions makes no
 “ possible Sense in this Place.”
 Yes, just the same Sense, as אָתִי for אָוֹתִי is *me*
cum, as much as אָתִי is.

Ch. xxi. 12.

“ The Word מְעַלְלֵיהֶם *studia eorum* was ori-
 “ ginally in this MS. [sc. 2.] מְעַלְלִיכֶם *studia*
 “ *vestra*—so the antient Versions, and so the
 “ printed Text, in *Ver. 14.*”

And the printed Text seems to be, at least may be, in the right in both Places. The Prophet is sent with a Message to the People, and to the House of *David*: In this Verse he directs himself to the House of *David* to see Justice done, and to exert themselves with all Diligence, lest the Wrath of God should be poured out upon them for *the Evil of their Doings*, who oppressed their Brethren. A Reformation would have prevented the Wrath of God coming upon them ; and the House of *David*, had they exerted themselves, might have brought about the happy Amendment. In *Verse 14*, he is speaking to the People, who said *who shall come down against us* : So it was necessary the Word should be there as it is printed, and not at all improper in the other Place, since the Sins of Violence and Injustice in those who acted under the House of *David* were what had provoked God, and he says, he would visit, *because of the Evil of their Doings*.

Ch.

Cb. xxiii. 33. אֶת מָה מִשְׁא.

“ A Dissociation of Letters—which he [Meibomius] reads אֶת מִשְׁא. See the Con-
text and antient Versions.”

It is Sense as it stands divided now, and explained Ver. 36, for his *Word* shall be to every Man **מִשְׁא** the Burthen: They asked *what* is the Burthen, the Prophet is ordered to say unto them אֶת מָה the *what*; that which they said themselves, **דְּבָרָו** *their own Word*, is the Burthen: They said God had forsaken them, and came to the Prophet to know what Burthen from the Lord—God bids the Prophet to say unto them,

“ אֶת מָה מִשְׁא that is the Burthen, I will
“ even forsake you, says the Lord.”

What Sense *Meibomius* would make of it, is not so apparent—*ye are the Burthen, &c.*

Cb. xxvii. 1.

“ In the Beginning of the Reign of *Jeboiakim*
“ the Son of *Josiah*.
“ Some Transcriber seems to have writ *Jebo-
iakim* instead of *Zedekiab*—not considering
“ that *Zedekiab* was also *Josiah's Son*.”

Because I suppose the Bonds and Yoaks were not sent to the several Nations mentioned, till the Reign of *Zedekiab*, when they sent their Agents to him for a Confederacy against *Nebuchadnezzar*, on which *Zedekiab* rebelled, and *Jerusalem* was destroyed, as well as all those other Nations; but see *Jer. xxv.* their Destruction was pronounced in the fourth Year of *Jeboikim*, though the Yoaks were not sent till the Reign of *Zedekiab*, at that critical time of their general Confederacy.

Cb. xxxii. 23.

“ בְּחַרְתְּךָ, in the printed Text is become
“ בְּחַרְתְּךָ.”

Suppose we construe the Word as it stands printed, as derived from *חר*, or *חר*, to search out and de-
termine.

vise, Eccles. i. 13, vii. 25, &c. I applied my Heart so know, and search, and seek out Wisdom; the Sense would be the same as if derived from תְּרוּ' to instruct: Then,

“ they obeyed not thy Voice, neither walked
“ in the Things devised for them [viz. the Cu-
“ stoms, Ceremonies] they have done no-
“ thing of all thou commandedst them.”

But if derived from תְּרוּ' it is not the only Place where the י is dropped; see Job. xii. 7, 8, twice. But I must confess, that for my Part, I prefer the marginal Word, as our Author does; and yet cannot help thinking, but that useless Word, wisely in the Remark upon Leusden, might have been omitted.

Ch. xxxviii. 19.

Here יְנָא is supposed to be a Corruption; but we are left to guess why יְנָא signifies *ubi*, 2 Kings xix. 33. Mich. vii. 10, &c. and why not so here. הַנָּא is very often writ with a י instead of an נ, and why not יְנָא in the same Manner?

Ch. xlvi. 6.

“ Some MSS. have נְגַדְּנוּ נָא, instead of the
“ new coined Pronoun יְנָא; the Points of
“ which determine it to have been formerly
“ יְגַדְּנוּ.” p. 514.

It is true that יְנָא occurs but once as a Pronoun, *nos*, [as far as I know] but is very frequently. And as נ is a *Formative*, it is not certain that the Scribe has coined the Word. יְ, נְגַדְּנוּ, נְגַדְּנוּ are all the 1st Person plural, which without entering into the Derivation of the Words, looks as if they had other Rules for forming their Pronouns, than have been yet settled or considered. יְנָא is as regularly Plural from אָנָא as יְנָא is Singular, or it may be formed with an נ as so many other *Nouns* are. The Points do not determine it to have been writ otherwise formerly; but only that they who put the Points

Points latterly to the Text, understood it to be of the same Meaning with **אנחנו**.

Cb. xlix. 30.

“ **עליהם** *super eos*, should *most undoubtedly* “ *be uniform with the preceding* **עליכם** *su-* “ *per vos.*”

For which you must take the Author’s Word, that being *most undoubtedly* right, which he is positive of; though nothing is more common in the Prophets than this *Change of Person*, sometimes directing their Voice to the Persons spoke of, and sometimes speaking of them in the 3d Person. Let the Reader only run through this, and the preceding Chapter, and he will find so many Instances of it, that he will wonder what the Gentleman was thinking of, when he thought himself so sure of a Mistake here.

Cb. l. 11.

“ In this Verse we have four Mistakes of the “ same kind,—four Verbs ending with ‘ in- “ stead of 1;’” p. 515.

four *versional* Mistakes, not *textual*; God is speaking of *Chaldea* or *Babylon*:

“ *Chaldea* shall be a Spoil; all that spoil her “ shall be satisfied, says the Lord.”

Then, as usual in Scripture, changing the *Person*, and directing himself to *Babylon*—

“ Because thou wast glad; because thou hast “ exulted; hast laid waste mine Inheritance; “ because thou art grown fat as a Heifer at “ Grass, and dost bellow as Bulls.”

We have seen before that it is usual to post-fix ‘ to the 2d Person Feminine; and this Passage wanted only to be right construed.

Cb. li. 3.

“ **אל ידרך הדרך** *Where we read in Print* **אל**, “ *Words, the Impropriety of which is too* “ *striking to need a Comment.*” p. 514.

Glaffius, under *Canon* xxiii. has cleared this Text, and shewn that the Sense requires יְרַרְךָ twice. It is certain that the relative Pronoun is frequently understood, of which he gives many Instances, inter al. *Exod.* iv. 13. *Send I pray thee by the Hand thou wilt send*, sc. of him *thou wilt send* by, so in this Text. *Against him that shall bend, shall the Archer bend his Bow*; so our Translation; so *Ju-nius* and others have construed it. Some it is true have taken לֹא as a *Negative* here, not; but as the Context will admit, if it does not require, which it seems to do, its *prepositional Sense*;

“ this surprising Continuation of *tendat, tendat,*
“ *dat,*

is a surprising Inattention in our Author to the Meaning of the Words, and to the Construction of them, given by Men of Note and Learning, which removes at once the *striking Impropriety* supposed to be in them.

Ver. 34. p. 515.

“ If ' has supplanted י four times, Ch. I. 11.
“ here we shall find the latter to have made
“ ample Reprisals, having supplanted the for-
“ mer five times.”

We have seen under the last Head but one that ' has done י no injury, the *Versions* having borne false Evidence, which misled our Author, who always finds more Pleasure in *amending* the Text than *rectifying* the Translation. It is the *Translator*, I take it, and not the *Transcriber*, who is to be set right here again; and י should be rendered *him* and not *me*: God is the Speaker, and in this and the preceding Chapter denounces Vengeance against *Babylon* in Revenge of *Israel*.

“ Thus says the Lord of Hosts, the God of
“ *Israel*: The Daughter of *Babylon* is like a
“ Threshing-floor; it is time to thresh her;
“ yet a little while and the time of Harvest
“ shall

" shall come upon her. *Nebu^{ch}adnezzar*
 " King of *Babylon* hath devoured *him*, he
 " hath crushed *him*, he hath made *him* an
 " empty Vessel, he hath swallowed *him* up
 " like a Dragon, he hath filled his Belly with
 " my Delicates, he hath driven *him* away :
 " *My Violence, and my Flesh* be upon *Babylon*,
 " shall the Inhabitant of *Sion* say : Therefore,
 " thus saith the Lord, behold I will plead thy
 " Cause."

But who does *him* refer to? Why *Israel*, or the Inhabitant of *Sion*, who is the Burthen of the two Chapters; and though he is not expressly mentioned in this Verse, is sufficiently implied by the Sense, and general Context. You have an Instance of the same Nature, *Verse 52*, where *Babylon* is understood in the same Manner; and *Numbers* of others might be produced, were it in the least necessary. As God is the Speaker, *my Delicates*, is very proper, because there were Treasures of rich Spices, Oil, Wine, and Corn, which were sacred for the Use of the Temple, which, with all the holy Utensils, *Nebuchadnezzar* had taken away; and God calls them his, because they were dedicated to him; and this breeds no Confusion, though the Pronoun, is of the 3d Person in the next Word, because he is speaking of *Israel*, who had the keeping of those Treasures; and for plundering whereof, and the manifold Injuries she had afflicted him with, *Babylon* was now to suffer.

I hope that, and I may rest quietly where they are, for disturbing of them will only disturb the Sense of two plain Passages.

Page 515 contains some Corrections in *Ezekiel*, *Chapters xvi. xxii. and xxxvii.* which I suppose the Reader by this time will be determined about, either for or against: And the Reader may see in these

Chapters many Instances of ' suffixed to Verbs in the 2d Person Feminine. As to those in

Cb. xl. 6, &c. I do not understand what is meant by *voluntary Assimilation*: And,

Cb. xlvi. I do not, nor do I see [if I may say so without Offence] that our Author does, understand it enough to be able to say, which is, or which is not, the right Reading *by the Sense*.

Hosea vi. 4, 5. p. 517.

There is a mighty Difficulty pretended here in the Words,

“ וְמִשְׁפְּטֵךְ אָוֹר יְצָא ”

“ That these Words are greatly irregular, suf-

“ ficiently appears from their having been

“ very perplexing to Dr. *Pocock*.”

But our Author happily by meer Chance stumbled upon the true Account of them;

“ an accidental Attention to the Sound of

“ these Words led me to the true Account of

“ them ;”

viz. that never failing Resource of a blundering Transcriber, who *mis-bearing* what was *dictated* to him, as he was writing, made that *blundering Division* now,

“ in all the present MSS. as well as *printed*

“ *Editions*, ”

instead of, וְמִשְׁפְּטֵךְ כָּאֹר יְצָא, as it ought to be; which Correction *Meibomius* had fallen upon, as our Author has *since* found out; and that this

“ is the *true and original Reading*, is clear

“ from the Context; and it is confirmed by

“ every antient Version, except the *Vulgar*.”

p. 518.

The Versions, I must confess, I set but little by, for Reasons that need not be repeated, in determining the *true Reading* of the Text: It being so very common with them, to make the *Hebrew*, when they did not understand it, to say what they pleased;

pleased ; and they were in the right of it, for they would not have translated half of it else. The Context, and obvious Meaning of the Text itself, I submit to here, which let us enquire into.

" O Ephraim what can I do for thee ? What can I do for thee O Judah ? For your Goodness is as a Morning Cloud, and as the early Dew, it goeth away : Therefore I bewe them by the Prophets, I slay them by the Words of my Mouth ; and the Judgments on thee go forth as the Light ; as eminent and as visible.—Hebrew, *by Judgments*, i. e. God's Judgments upon them ; as *my Violence*, Jer. li. 35, cited just above, is *the Violence done to me*, as it is translated. These Judgments upon them were plain Warnings to them, as plain as the Light ; and yet though God bewe them by the Prophets, and slew them by the Words of his Mouth, i. e. first threatened, and then executed his Judgments upon them, they would take no Instruction. Thus I think the Text, and Context agree mighty well ; nay the Connection seems to require the present Reading ; which I believe had never been disputed, had the Context been attended to, and the obvious Meaning of *thy Judgments*, or *Judgments on thee* had not somehow or other escaped the Translators. As to the Change of Person, first speaking of *them*, then *as to them*, let the Usage of Scripture, be observed. And our Author may take back his blundering Division, which he seems so surprisingly fond of ; it is no great Matter which has the Credit of it, *Meibomius*, or himself.

Hos. x. 14.

" Because thou didst trust in thy Way ; in the Multitude of thy mighty Men ; therefore

" תְּמַנּוּ בְּעָמָד."

The **ת** is supposed superfluous in **תְּמַנּוּ**, because the Versions render it by *Consurgent*, as if from **תְּמַנֵּה** ; but

but they may possibly be mistaken. *Israel* trusted in their mighty Men, and their Fortifications, and the Prophet tells them, that a *Whirlwind*, or Desolation among their People, should vomit them, their mighty Men, forth, and their Fortresses should be spoiled. The Expression of vomiting forth is frequent on such Occasions, as the Reader may see under קָרְבָּן. It is impossible that נ should be inserted to express a *Kametz*, unless the Points had been coeval with the Letters: And the Supposition is founded on the Mis-construction of the Words, it is supposed to be inserted in.

Cb. xiii. 10. אַחֲ מֶלֶךְ אָפֹא וַיּוֹשַׁעַךְ

“ The true Reading is אַחֲ, is evident—see all the antient Versions: And the Supposition is אַחֲ אָפֹא is *ubinam nunc*; see *Job xvii. 15.*” p. 514. The Versions would authorise as many Alterations in the Text almost as there are Words in it, if they could authorise any one. The LXX led the way, and the rest follow them in most of their Blunders and Variations from the Text; and we have Reason to protest against their Authority in settling what is Text. Nor is אַחֲ necessary to be joined with אָפֹא, which is *ubinam* by itself; see *Gen. xxvii. 33. Exod. xxxiii. 16.* It is not נִפְאָן, *Job xvii. 15.* but אָפֹא; and though אַחֲ be with נִפְאָן there, אַפְּה is *ubi* without it, *Cb. xxxviii. 4.* So that נִפְאָן will not justify the Correction proposed, nor does the Context require, but rather disclaims it.

“ O *Israel*, thou hast destroyed thyself, when thy Help was in me, I was thy King. Where is even one that can save thee, in any of thy Cities: And thy Judges of whom thou saidst, give me a King and Princes?”

It is evident the Context will admit of the present Reading, which runs easy and natural—I was thine Helper, I was thy King; ye rejected me, your Help,

your King, where is there even one to save thee now; and thy Judges, thy King, and thy Princes, where are they? If the present Reading be good Sense, and consistent with the Context, the only Question will be, why all the *antient Versions*, i. e. why the LXX. and after them the others, mistranslated what one would think they could not but understand. Which Question I answer with another, why have they misread the Text, as if they mistook one similar Letter for another, in so many other Instances where the Mistake must be wilful, or downright Carelessness?

But the same Corruption of 'אָהָן for אִירָה obtains in another Place, of more Consequence, namely,

Verse 14.

" I will ransom them from the Power of the
 " Grave; I will redeem them from Death; O
 " Death I will be thy Plagues; O Grave I
 " will be thy Destruction; Repentance shall
 " be hid from mine Eyes."

This our Author would render,

" I will ransom them from the Power of the
 " Grave; I will redeem them from Death:
 " O Death where is thy Sting, O Grave where
 " is thy Victory? Repentance shall be hid
 " from mine Eyes."

And says, that this is the true Reading is evident from the Context, p. 514. I appeal to the Context, which I have laid before the Reader, as I dare say, the Gentleman would have done, would it admit with any Propriety or Consistency, the Alteration proposed. And let me also ask where he finds דְּבִירִיךְ to be *Sting*, or קְטַבְּךְ to be *Victory*, as he would have it according to the Apostle; or *Sting*, according to the LXX? And how it appears that the Apostle intended to cite this Passage of Hosea, 1 Cor. xv. 55? — *Then shall be brought to pass, the Saying that is written, Death shall be swallowed*

lived up in Victory. O Death where is thy Sting ; O Grave where is thy Victory ? The Prophet predicts what the Apostle asserts Christ had brought to pass : The Prophets says, God would be the destruction of Death, and the Apostle after having enlarged upon the Conquest over Death, now actually obtained, breaks forth into that Rapture—O Death where is thy Sting, O Grave where is thy Victory ? Has his Eye no doubt upon the Prophecy, and suits the Expression to his own Context, and Emotion of Mind at the joyful Sight. Had the Prophet asked the Question, Death might have pointed to the Grave, and exultingly replied, *it is bere*. But when he was disarmed of his Sting, and swallowed up in Victory, there was Beauty in the Question : Neither the Time nor the Context admit of the *Interrogative* in the Prophet ; for what does *Repentance shall be bid from mine Eyes*, refer to, if the Sentences before be interrogatory ?

Zach. xiv. 5.

וְבָא יְהוָה אֱלֹהִי כָּל קְרִשִׁים עַמָּךְ.

This is corrected into,

וְבָא יְהוָה אֱלֹהִי וְכָל קְרִשִׁים עַמָּךְ p. 427.

The whole Passage should have been explained, and the Reader let into the Design of it, before any Corrections had been proposed ; or else he will want the Touchstone to judge of the Amendment by, whether it be Sterling or not. I beg leave to propose the general Meaning, according to my Apprehension of it, which is the purging of Jerusalem from its Sins by the Coming of Christ, and the great Addition to be made to the Church by the Call of the Gentiles ; let the Reader run the Chapter through, and that in this 5th Verse the Prophet is directing himself to Judah, or the same Person he speaks to in the 1st, and says—*The Lord my God shall bring all the Saints with thee* ; i. e. gather together him that feareth him out of every Nation, [as Ver. 16.]

to Jerusalem to worship the King the Lord of Hosts ; for Ver. 9. the Lord shall be King over all the Earth. If it is the Call of the Gentiles into the Church, and the Destruction of the old Jerusalem that are treated of, the controverted Text may stand as it does ; but settle the Meaning of this mystical Chapter, and we shall better judge of the Criticisms upon it.

I have now gone through with the many Instances of the [supposed] Incorrectness of the Transcripts, our present Copy of the Hebrew Scriptures was printed from : And it is with Pleasure I finish the tedious Task of unravelling Confusions, where Appearances have supplied the Place of Realities ; and a strong Prejudice, and heated Imagination, of Evidence ; every thing having been eagerly catched at, that looked any thing like an *Erratum* ; and the Errors of the Translations imputed to the Text. And what is very surprising, the Text supposed to be corrupted, not because it is not *Sense* and *Grammar*, but because the Translations retranslated back again, do not correspond *literally* with their *Original*, though the *Sense* be the same either way. And all this under a real, as I hope, Zeal for the Honour of the Word of God ; and without any *Mixture of Vanity* in having so great a Share in determining that important Question—*What is to be translated?* That our Author's Zeal has in some Instances out-run his Knowledge, I presume I may venture to say, and shall think, till the contrary is shewn. And though I am not so sanguine as to contend for the *absolute Integrity* of our present Copies, yet the *Gold* does not need the Furnace to be new cast, Gold is the only Metal that will not *contract Dross and Defilement*, and our Author's Parallel, p. 556, founded on a *mistranslated* Text of Scripture, is as wide of true Philosophy, as most of his Corrections are of true Criticism. I shall borrow a few Lines from the next Page,

Page, and apply to the Author what he does to one, who in his Phrase, *is severely censurable*, and whose unparralled Aversion to the Word of God, and *weak, weak*, Reasoning against it, will transmit his Name to Posterity with as great a Blot upon it, in respect to the Duty and Submission due to the heavenly King, as it stands loaded with respect to his Allegiance to his earthly King; what Mr. Kennicott says of him, is in some measure applicable to his own Work: “ Many of the preceding Reflections not being accompanied with Proof, contain *only his Opinion*; and we must remember that it is the Opinion of one, who took most of what he has censured from Translations—all of which *have many Faults* of their own to answer for. That there are some Mistakes in the present Copies of the Hebrew Scriptures, is certain: But we deny that they are *so broken and confused as represented*; or that they *are full of Additions, Interpolations, and Transpositions*; since if all the corrupted Places could be collected, they would probably be *so few* in Comparison of the Places *objected to*, as to bear but a *very small Proportion*.” Buxtorf’s *very round and dogmatical Periods*, cited p. 264, seem to contain good and sound Advice—in the main. *Adfer judicium solidum et masculum, fide Textui Hebræo, diligenter eum expande, linguae Hebrææ accuratam cognitionem tibi compara, interpres consule; et semper in Textu Hebraico Hodierno veram, commodam, et cum antecedentibus et consequentibus convenientem lectionem invenies—loca multa eværtioφævn esse concedimus, eværtia negamus.* And with recommending this ingenuous Advice to the more calm Consideration of our Author, I take my Leave of him at present, protesting that I bear him no personal Disrespect. But if his unjustifiable Freedoms with the Word of God, Ignorance in the Text he makes himself

himself a Judge of, and criminal Prejudice against the Integrity of it, have now and then raised an honest Indignation, I am sure that even he himself will not be offended at it—provided that Truth, and a real Zeal for the Word of God be at the Bottom of his Work ; which if they are not, I am to expect no Favour ; and I should scorn to accept it on any other Footing.

F I N I S.

ERRATA.

Page 3. l. 17. *Joshue*, r. *Jeshua*.
l. 22. *Laws*, r. *Law*.
p. 4. l. 14. *their*, r. *the*.
p. 5. l. 7. *tbers*, r. *their*.
p. 9. l. 1. *tis*, r. *tis*.
p. 11. l. 6. *tion*, r. *tion*.
p. 41. l. 33. *be*, r. *God*.
p. 45. l. 11. *sportam*, r. *sporta*.
p. 48. l. 27. *on*, r. *or*.
p. 53. l. 2. *to into*, r. *to go into*.
p. 57. l. 5. *obseruſſ*, r. *allowed*.
p. 69. l. 35. *in*, r. *into*.
p. 81. l. 1. *dele*, instead of vi. 6.
p. 87. l. 29. *speaks*, r. *bespeaks*.
p. 97. l. 15. *geris*, r. *generis*.
p. 118. l. 8. *oft*, r. *of*.
owns, r. Towns.
p. 142. l. 19. *multilation*, r. *mutilation*.

